



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 26, 2010

No. 59

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MORAN of Virginia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 26, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JAMES P. MORAN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HINOJOSA) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Ever-present God, who knows us through and through, hasten to help us and strengthen the faith and unity of Your people.

Give us courage to attack what is evil and surrounds itself with negativity. History shows us You will fortify the just, lift up the lowly, and cleanse the pure of heart.

Empower us to accomplish what is good and give You the glory now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BURGESS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II

of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 26, 2010 at 9:31 a.m.:

That the Senate concur in the House amendment to the bill S. 1963.

That the Senate passed S. 3253.

That the Senate agreed to with an amendment H. Con. Res. 255.

Appointments:

Commission on Key National Indicators
With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RULEMAKING GIVES US AN IDEA OF WHAT TO EXPECT WITH NEW HEALTH REFORM LAW

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, 14 months ago this House passed in the stimulus bill a measure that contained \$20 billion for information technology relating to health care. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services published a rule on January 13 of this year to determine qualifications of what determined a so-called meaningful user and who will be able to receive this funding.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I spoke to the American Hospital Association. Our Nation's hospitals are almost unanimous in their dissatisfaction with the rules coming out of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. These rules are misguided, rigid, and in fact unattainable.

In fact, a bipartisan group of 248 members of this House of Representatives agreed. Further, instead of incentivizing compliance, these rules punish noncompliance. This undoubtedly gives us an idea of what we can expect with the rulemaking and regulation that will occur at the Centers for

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2847

Medicare and Medicaid Services, Health and Human Services, Office of Personnel Management, and, for crying out loud, the Internal Revenue Service as they go through this same process addressing the new health care reform law. This will go on for years, and in fact decades, perhaps even generations.

Doctors, hospitals, information technology manufacturers, medical device manufacturers, and all Americans need to stay alert and pay attention to what's coming out of the agencies here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of us to stay involved and active. The stimulus and the reform bill will affect how health care is delivered for generations to come.

ARIZONA VOTERS LIKE NEW LAW

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, while pro-amnesty advocates are busy criticizing Arizona's new immigration enforcement law, Arizona voters are registering their overwhelming support. According to a Rasmussen Reports telephone survey, 70 percent of likely voters in Arizona approve of the legislation, including 84 percent of Republicans, 69 percent of independents, and more than half of Democrats. These results are not surprising.

Arizonans are no different from other Americans. They want to see the Nation's immigration laws enforced. They are rightly concerned about the jobs that illegal immigrants take from citizens and legal immigrants, about their communities' safety, and about the substantial costs to taxpayers of illegal immigration.

If the Obama administration continues to ignore immigration laws, it should not be surprised if other States follow Arizona's example.

HONORING ANTHONY "TONY" J. CORTESE

(Mr. HONDA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and work of my friend, Anthony "Tony" J. Cortese. For the past four decades, Mr. Cortese was a proud and dedicated employee of the United States Postal Service.

I am proud to stand on the floor today in support of H.R. 4543, legislation to designate the Westgate Station Post Office in my district of San Jose, California, in memory of Mr. Cortese. I would also like to thank my good friend and the sponsor of this legislation, Congresswoman ZOE LOFGREN, for working closely with me on this effort.

Mr. Cortese was born in the San Francisco Bay area and moved to Santa Clara County with his family after his father took a job at the Ford plant in Milpitas. A few years after

graduating James Lick High School in San Jose, Mr. Cortese started working as a letter carrier in the downtown San Jose post office.

Mr. Cortese was a tireless advocate for letter carriers in the region and made a significant impact on our community. In addition to his 42 years with the Postal Service, Mr. Cortese served 27 years as the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers Local 193. Under his leadership, this local procured a building for its members, secured expanded health benefits, and provided an open forum for discussion with union members, community advocates, and local elected officials.

Throughout his tenure, Mr. Cortese developed strong relationships with postal workers and management. His legacy and accomplishments at the Postal Service will not be forgotten.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Anthony Cortese, and ask my colleagues to support naming a post office in his honor. I want to congratulate the family, and I want to give a personal thanks, because without his work my family would not have benefited from the kinds of things he has done in our community.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO SELECT INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT PANEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4(a)(5) of rule X, and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Select Intelligence Oversight Panel of the Committee on Appropriations:

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

ANTHONY J. CORTESE POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4543) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4285 Payne Avenue in San Jose, California, as the "Anthony J. Cortese Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4543

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ANTHONY J. CORTESE POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4285

Payne Avenue in San Jose, California, shall be known and designated as the "Anthony J. Cortese Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Anthony J. Cortese Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House subcommittee with jurisdiction over the United States Postal Service, I am proud to present H.R. 4543 for consideration. This legislation will designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4285 Payne Avenue in San Jose, California, as the Anthony J. Cortese Post Office Building.

Introduced by my friend and colleague Representative ZOE LOFGREN of California on January 27, 2010, H.R. 4543 was favorably reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on April 14, 2010, by unanimous consent. In addition, this legislation enjoys the overwhelming support of the California House delegation.

A 55-year resident of San Jose, California, Mr. Anthony Cortese was born in the East Bay city of Richmond, California, and graduated from James Lick High School in San Jose. While in his early twenties, Mr. Cortese began working for the United States Postal Service as a letter carrier in the downtown San Jose post office and continued to serve as a proud Postal Service employee for over 40 years. As a letter carrier, Mr. Cortese became an active member of his union, the National Association of Letter Carriers Local 193. Mr. Cortese climbed the ranks from shop steward to vice president, and in 1981 was elected union president, a position he proudly held for 27 years.

As president of Local 193 for nearly 30 years, Mr. Cortese devoted his efforts to advancing the well-being of his fellow letter carriers. Notably, Mr. Cortese successfully procured a union-owned headquarters building for the members of Local 193. He helped expand member health benefits and established an open, meaningful, and continuing dialogue between his union members and Federal, State, and local elected officials.

However, Mr. Cortese's service was not just limited to his efforts on behalf

of his fellow letter carriers. Rather, Mr. Cortese's commitment to public service could be evidenced by his effort to benefit the entire San Jose community. Specifically, in 1990, Mr. Cortese established a local food drive initiative, sponsored by the National Association of Letter Carriers, that since 1991 has become a national food drive held every year on the first Saturday before Mother's Day.

Regrettably, Mr. Cortese passed away on February 11, 2007. However, while Mr. Cortese is no longer with us, his memory and legacy of public service will live on through his family, his friends, his community, and of course his fellow letter carriers.

Mr. Speaker, let us further honor the life and legacy of this letter carrier and former union president Anthony Cortese through the passage of H.R. 4543, which will designate the postal facility located at 4285 Payne Avenue in San Jose, California, in his honor. I urge my colleagues to join me and the bill sponsor, ZOE LOFGREN from California.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4543, designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4285 Payne Avenue in San Jose, California, as the Anthony J. Cortese Post Office Building.

□ 1415

A graduate of James Lick High School in San Jose, Mr. Cortese started working as a letter carrier in his early twenties. He was known for his outgoing nature and ability to work collaboratively to get things done, whether he was resolving workplace issues or organizing charitable work in the local community.

As president of the National Letter Carriers Association Branch 193 for over 26 years, Mr. Cortese had one of the longest tenures of any local labor official. Not only did Mr. Cortese help build membership of more than 1,000 local postal workers into a political force, he also helped to initiate a food drive in which letter carriers collected donations for the Second Harvest Food Bank for families in the San Jose area. This program served as a pilot for what ultimately became a national food drive sponsored by the NALC. The program continues today and is just one of the generous contributions Mr. Cortese made to his community and his country.

Sadly, this outstanding citizen of San Jose died of a heart condition on February 11, 2007. He leaves behind his wife, Barbara; his daughter, Caroline; his sister, Mary; and his grandchildren, Austin and Ashley.

For his tireless efforts for his fellow postal workers and people in need throughout the country, it is fitting that we name the post office in Tony Cortese's honor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his kind remarks. And I would encourage my colleagues to join the lead sponsor of this measure, ZOE LOFGREN from California, in supporting H.R. 4543.

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4543, a bill to designate the U.S. Post Office located at 4285 Payne Avenue in San Jose, California, as the Anthony J. Cortese Post Office.

For over four decades, Mr. Cortese was a proud and dedicated employee of the United States Postal Service. He was also a loving family man, respected community leader, and a friend to many of us in local government.

Mr. Cortese was born in the East Bay and moved to Santa Clara County with his family after his father went to work at the Ford Plant in Milpitas. A few years after graduating from James Lick High School in San Jose, Mr. Cortese started working as a letter carrier in the downtown San Jose post office.

Mr. Cortese was a tireless advocate for letter carriers in the region and made a significant impact on his community. In addition to his forty-two years with the Postal Service, Mr. Cortese served twenty-seven years as the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers Local 193. Under his leadership, Local 193 procured a building for its members, secured expanded health benefits, and provided an open forum for discussion with union members, community advocates, Postal Service supervisors, and local elected officials. Throughout his tenure, Mr. Cortese developed strong relationships with postal workers and management.

Mr. Cortese's service was not limited to advocacy of union members, but extended into the San Jose community and beyond. In 1990, Mr. Cortese started a food drive program through the Second Harvest Food Bank to help needy families in the San Jose area. Under Mr. Cortese's guidance, this program served as a pilot for what would become a national food drive sponsored by the National Association of Letter Carriers.

I urge all of my colleagues to join Congressman MIKE HONDA and me to vote in favor of this bill to honor our good friend, Anthony J. Cortese.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4543.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF SAM HOUSTON

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1103) celebrating the life

of Sam Houston on the 217th anniversary of his birth, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1103

Whereas Sam Houston was born at Timber Ridge Church, near Lexington, Virginia, on March 2, 1793;

Whereas Sam Houston as an enlisted soldier fought courageously in the War of 1812, and after receiving three near-mortal wounds at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend, rose to the rank of first lieutenant;

Whereas Sam Houston studied law, was admitted to the bar in 1818, and commenced practice in Lebanon, Tennessee;

Whereas Sam Houston became District Attorney in 1819, Adjutant General of the State in 1820, and Major General in 1821;

Whereas Sam Houston was elected to the United States Congress for the State of Tennessee in 1823 and again in 1825 before serving as Governor from 1827 to 1829;

Whereas Sam Houston moved to Oklahoma, served as an advocate for Native American rights and a representative of the Cherokee Nation, and then became a Cherokee citizen on October 21, 1829;

Whereas Sam Houston moved to Texas in 1835 and joined the movement to establish separate statehood for Texas;

Whereas Sam Houston was elected as the commander-in-chief of the armies of Texas in 1836;

Whereas, on April 21, 1836, Sam Houston's forces defeated Mexican President and General Santa Anna, securing Texas' long sought independence;

Whereas the city of Houston, Texas, was named after then-President of the Republic of Texas, Sam Houston, on June 5, 1837;

Whereas Sam Houston was elected the first President of the Republic of Texas and served 2 terms, followed by 2 years with the Texas Congress, after which he returned to serve as President from 1841 to 1844;

Whereas, after Texas joined the Union in 1845, Sam Houston was elected Senator to the United States Congress and served from 1846 to 1859;

Whereas Sam Houston once again resigned his position with Congress to serve as Governor of Texas from 1859 to 1861;

Whereas Sam Houston was deposed on March 18, 1861, because he refused to take the oath of allegiance to the Confederate States;

Whereas Sam Houston died in Huntsville, Texas, on July 26, 1863, and was then interred in Oakwood Cemetery;

Whereas Sam Houston is the only person in United States history to have been the Governor of 2 different States, Tennessee and Texas;

Whereas a memorial museum, U.S. Army base, national forest, historical park, university, and the largest free-standing statue of a United States figure recognize the life of Sam Houston; and

Whereas Sam Houston still stands as a symbol for Texas solidarity and is one of the most significant individuals in the history of Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives honors the life and accomplishments of Sam Houston for his historical contributions to the expansion of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, I present House Resolution 1103 for consideration. This resolution honors the life and accomplishments of Sam Houston for his historical contributions to the expansion of the United States.

Introduced by my friend and colleague, Representative MIKE MCCAUL of Texas, on February 24, 2010, House Resolution 1103 was favorably reported out of the Oversight Committee on April 14, 2010, by unanimous consent. In addition, the legislation enjoys the support of over 50 Members of Congress.

As we all know, Sam Houston, a 19th century American soldier, statesman and politician, played a pivotal role in the development of the State of Texas as well as our collective national history. As a soldier enlisted in the 7th Infantry Regiment, Private and then-First Lieutenant Houston fought courageously in the Battle of 1812 during which he received nearly mortal wounds at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend in March of 1814.

As a practicing attorney in the State of Tennessee, Mr. Houston served as a district attorney in 1819, as the State's adjutant general in 1820, and then as a major general in 1821.

As a United States Representative elected to the 18th and 19th Congresses, Mr. Houston proudly represented the State of Tennessee before his service as the State's Governor from 1827 to 1829. As a subsequent resident of the State of Oklahoma, Mr. Houston served as a vocal advocate in support of Native American rights and in 1829 was recognized as a member of the Cherokee Nation by the Cherokee National Council. However, Mr. Houston is best known for his relentless efforts to secure statehood for Texas.

In 1835, Mr. Houston moved to the Texas territory and promptly served as a member of the convention at San Felipe de Austin, a gathering of colonists designed to promote and establish separate statehood for Texas. One year later, Mr. Houston was elected to serve as commander in chief of the Texas army and in this capacity successfully led his volunteer Texas forces against those of Mexican General Antonio Lopez de Santa Ana in the Battle of San Jacinto. Notably, the battle cul-

minated with the signing of the Treaty of Velasco, which recognized the Republic of Texas.

In recognition of his service, Mr. Houston was subsequently elected to serve as the first President of the Texas Republic, a position that he held from 1836 to 1838 and again from 1841 to 1844. Fittingly, the city of Houston was named after the President of the Texas Republic in 1837.

Mr. Houston also served the Texas Republic as a member of the Texas Congress from 1838 to 1840, and upon Texas' admission as a State into the Union, served as a United States Senator from the 31st through the 34th Congresses. Mr. Houston would also serve as Governor of the State of Texas from 1859 to 1861, making him the only person in the United States to ever have served as the Governor of two different States. Notably, Mr. Houston's tenure as a Texas Governor ended with his refusal to take an oath of loyalty to the Confederacy following Texas' secession from the Union, an act that Mr. Houston deemed illegal.

Mr. Houston died on July 26, 1863, at the age of 70. Fittingly, his last words, as spoken to his wife, Margaret, were reportedly: "Texas, Texas, Margaret . . ."

Mr. Speaker, let us honor the lasting contributions of Sam Houston to the State of Texas and our national history through the passage of this resolution, H. Res. 1103.

I urge my colleagues to join Mr. MCCAUL of Texas in supporting H. Res. 1103.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today in support of H. Res. 1103, introduced by a fellow Texan and colleague, Congressman MIKE MCCAUL, honoring the life and accomplishments of Sam Houston for his historical contributions to the expansion of the United States.

Sam Houston lived an amazing and vibrant life. Shortly after moving to Tennessee from his home in the State of Virginia, Sam was drawn to the Cherokee Indians, a tribe that would have a profound impact on his life.

At the age of 19, Sam Houston enlisted in the military to fight the British in the War of 1812, where he distinguished himself for his bravery and was wounded several times in battle. After the war, his attention shifted to the study of law. In 1823, he was elected to the first of two terms here in this body, the United States Congress, before being elected Governor to the State of Tennessee in 1827. In 1828, Houston resigned from Tennessee politics, returning to live with his longtime friends, the Cherokee Indians.

In 1835, Sam Houston left the Cherokee and his life in Tennessee and moved to Texas, where he quickly gained notoriety for his leadership in seeking independence from Mexico. In

the wake of defeat at the Alamo on April 21, 1836, Houston rallied the armies of Texas to victory, decisively defeating Santa Anna and the Mexican Army at the Battle of San Jacinto, securing independence for Texas and his heroic place in the Nation's history.

Shortly after securing independence, Sam Houston was elected the first President of the Republic of Texas, beginning a long and successful career in Texas politics. He went on to serve a second term as President of the Republic before being elected as a United States Senator after statehood in 1845. In 1859, Houston continued his public service when he was elected Governor of the State of Texas and became the only person in U.S. history to serve as Governor in two States.

Though sometimes embroiled in controversy, Sam Houston was a passionate, dedicated statesman who played an important role in shaping this great Nation. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and honor the accomplishments of this important, if not heroic, figure in American history and the history of my home State, the great State of Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1103—Celebrating the life of Sam Houston on the 217th anniversary of his birth. Sam Houston was born March 2, 1793, in Tiber Ridge, Virginia.

General Houston was an American statesman, politician, and soldier. He is a key figure in the history of Texas, including periods as the 1st and 3rd president of the Republic of Texas, as Senator after annexation, and finally as governor.

In his early life, he moved to Tennessee, where he served in the military during the War of 1812 and later had a successful career in Tennessee politics. A fight with a Congressman led to his move to Texas, where he soon became a leader of the Texas Revolution.

Houston attended the Convention of 1833, representing Nacogdoches, and supported independence from Mexico. He was made a Major General of the Texas Army in November 1835, then Commander-in-Chief in March 1836, at the convention where he signed the Texas Declaration of Independence.

At the Battle of San Jacinto on April 21, 1836, General Houston surprised General Santa Ana and the Mexican forces, and in less than 18 minutes, the battle was over. General Santa Ana was forced to sign the Treaty of Velasco, granting Texas independence. During the battle General Houston was shot, shattering his ankle.

The settlement of Houston was founded in August 1836 by the Allen brothers. It was named in Houston's honor and served as capital.

Houston was twice elected president of the Republic of Texas. He served from October 1836 to December 1838, and again from December 1841 to December 1844. While he initially sought annexation by the U.S., he dropped that hope during his first term.

After the annexation of Texas by the United States in 1845, Houston was elected to the U.S. Senate. He served from February 1846 until March 1859.

He twice ran for governor of Texas, unsuccessfully in 1857 and successfully in 1859.

Despite Houston's being a slave owner and against abolition, he opposed the secession of Texas from the Union.

Despite Houston's wishes, Texas seceded from the United States in February 1861 and joined the Confederate States of America in March 1861. This act was soon branded illegal by Houston, but the Texas legislature nevertheless upheld the legitimacy of secession. The political forces that brought about Texas's secession also were powerful enough to replace the state's Unionist governor.

To avoid bloodshed, Governor Houston chose not to resist, and instead retired to Huntsville, Texas, where he died before the end of the Civil War. Today, Governor Houston has a memorial museum, a U.S. Army base, a national forest, a historical park, a university, and the largest free-standing statue of an American figure, in his honor.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, again I encourage my colleagues to join Mr. McCAUL and Mr. OLSON of Texas in supporting H. Res. 1103, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1103, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

STEVE GOODMAN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4861) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1343 West Irving Park Road in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Steve Goodman Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4861

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. STEVE GOODMAN POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1343 West Irving Park Road in Chicago, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Steve Goodman Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Steve Goodman Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add any extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House subcommittee with jurisdiction over the United States Postal Service, I am proud to present H.R. 4861 for consideration. This legislation will designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1343 West Irving Park Road in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Steve Goodman Post Office Building."

Introduced by my good friend and colleague, Representative MIKE QUIGLEY of Chicago, on March 16, 2010, H.R. 4861 was favorably reported out of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee on April 14, 2010 by unanimous consent. In addition, this legislation enjoys the support of the entire Illinois House delegation.

□ 1430

A beloved native of the City of Chicago, American folk singer and songwriter Steve Goodman was born on July 25, 1948, on Chicago's north side. Mr. Goodman graduated from Maine East High School in Park Ridge, Illinois, in 1965, and subsequently enrolled at the University of Illinois.

After 1 year, Mr. Goodman left the University of Illinois in order to pursue a musical career. In 1968, he began performing at the famed Earl of Old Town folk club in Chicago's Old Town neighborhood where he first attracted a large popular following and where he soon became a regular performer throughout the city. Mr. Goodman's subsequent and distinguished musical career evidenced his dual mastery of songwriting and performance as well as his genuine devotion to his hometown, and he left an indelible mark on both American folk music and on the city of Chicago.

As noted by the Chicago Tribune earlier this month, Mr. Goodman's collection of songs told "wondrous, intricate stories," and "if you were a fan and you lived in Chicago when he was alive, you couldn't help but feel like he was a private pleasure."

Notably, Mr. Goodman released 10 folk music albums during his life, which were followed by five posthumous releases. Included among his most enduring songs was the "City of New Orleans," a song about the Illinois Central's City of New Orleans train that was recorded by Arlo Guthrie and which became a top 20 hit in 1972. The song would also become an American standard, covered by such musicians as Johnny Cash and Willie Nelson, whose

recorded versions earned Mr. Goodman a posthumous Grammy Award in the Best Country Song category in 1985. Mr. Goodman later received a second posthumous Grammy Award in the Best Contemporary Folk Album category in 1988 for his critically acclaimed album "Unfinished Business."

Additionally, Mr. Goodman is well-known for writing and performing a variety of humorous songs about the City of Chicago, including "Daley's Gone," which is a eulogy of the late mayor Richard J. Daley, and "A Dying Cubs Fan's Last Request," also "When the Cubs Go Marching In" and "Go, Cubs, Go!" in honor of his beloved Chicago Cubs. The latter song can be heard playing on the loudspeakers at Wrigley Field after every Cubs' home win.

In addition to his musical contributions, Mr. Goodman is equally remembered for the courage and positivity that he always evidenced throughout his 15-year battle with leukemia. While Mr. Goodman was diagnosed with the disease at the early age of 20, in the words of the Chicago Tribune, he was always "a little guy with a huge smile, and he was Chicago."

Regrettably, Mr. Goodman passed away on September 20, 1984, at the age of 36. Four days after his death, the Cubs clinched the National League's Eastern Division title, and on October 2, 1984, they played their first post-season game since the 1945 World Series. While Mr. Goodman had been asked to sing the national anthem for the occasion, Jimmy Buffet performed the "Star-Spangled Banner" in his absence and dedicated the song to Mr. Goodman, whose ashes were subsequently scattered at Wrigley Field.

Mr. Speaker, let us honor the life and legacy of Mr. Goodman through the passage of this legislation, H.R. 4861, to designate the West Irving Park Road Post Office in his honor. I urge my colleagues to join Mr. QUIGLEY of Chicago in supporting H.R. 4861.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4861, designating the facility of the United States Post Office, located at 1343 West Irving Park Road in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Steve Goodman Post Office Building."

Born on July 25, 1948, in Chicago, Illinois, Steve Goodman began his lifelong musical career as a teenager. After graduating from Maine East High School in 1965, Mr. Goodman entered the University of Illinois and started a band called The Juicy Fruits with friends from the Sigma Alpha Mu fraternity.

After 1 year, he left college to pursue his musical career full time. He was a regular performer in Chicago, and often supported himself by singing commercials. He often performed, but he was known as an excellent and influential songwriter. Known more prominently

in folk music circles than in commercial venues, Mr. Goodman's music represented a chronicle of the times, including his many, many humorous songs about Chicago.

His legendary creation of the "City of New Orleans" got the attention of top recording artists, such as Arlo Guthrie, Johnny Cash, Judy Collins, Chet Atkins, and Willie Nelson, who all recorded this much-loved song. He was also known as a diehard Cubs fan, and his songs were often played at Wrigley Field. In 1984, his beloved Cubs won the Eastern Division title in the National League for the first time.

Sadly, Mr. Goodman died of leukemia before he could sing the "Star-Spangled Banner" for that first divisional post-season game. He was 36 years old. Jimmy Buffet filled in, dedicating the song to Mr. Goodman. Subsequently, some of Mr. Goodman's ashes were scattered at Wrigley Field.

I appreciate the opportunity to recognize this man of Chicago, Steve Goodman, who is world renowned for his many musical accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his kind remarks, and I urge my colleagues to join with the gentleman from Chicago, Illinois, Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY, in supporting H.R. 4861.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4861, a resolution to name the Post Office at 1343 West Irving Park Road after Steve Goodman.

Steve Goodman was a true Chicagoan, a legendary folk singer and songwriter and a faithful Cubs fan.

Sadly, Goodman succumbed to leukemia in 1984 at the young age of 36 after a courageous 15-year battle with the disease.

Over the course of his illness, Goodman wrote some of the most enduring American folk songs, including "The City of New Orleans," for which he won one of his two Grammy awards, and the great Chicago tune "Lincoln Park Pirates."

Goodman's career was inexorably intertwined with Chicago's Old Town School of Folk Music, where he learned his craft and befriended folk music luminaries such as Roger McGuinn of the Byrds, Bob Gibson, Bonnie Koloc, and John Prine.

While older Goodman fans are no doubt aware of his connection to the Cubs, best exemplified by his song "A Dying Cubs Fan's Last Request," in recent years younger generations have come to know Steve Goodman as the writer and performer of "Go, Cubs, Go," the anthem played at Wrigley Field following Cubs' wins.

Steve's spirit lives on after every Cubs home win, as thousands of fans happily head home from Wrigley singing, "Go Cubs, Go . . ."

With the passage of this legislation, it's possible that the strains of this happy tune will be heard on the steps of the Steve Goodman Post Office, not a mile up Clark Street from Wrigley Field.

Naming the Post Office at 1343 West Irving Park Road after Steve Goodman is a small but fitting way to honor the life and work of a

man whose music was always imbued with emotions and scenes of everyday life.

I urge the swift passage of this legislation. Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4861.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4543, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 1103, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 4861, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

ANTHONY J. CORTESE POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4543, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4543.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 370, nays 0, not voting 60, as follows:

Ackerman	Doggett	Lee (CA)
Aderholt	Donnelly (IN)	Lee (NY)
Adler (NJ)	Doyle	Levin
Akin	Dreier	Lewis (CA)
Alexander	Driehaus	Lewis (GA)
Altmire	Duncan	Linder
Andrews	Edwards (MD)	LoBiondo
Arcuri	Edwards (TX)	Loebuck
Austria	Ehlers	Lofgren, Zoe
Baca	Ellison	Lowe
Bachmann	Ellsworth	Lucas
Bachus	Emerson	Luetkemeyer
Baird	Engel	Lujan
Baldwin	Eshoo	Lummis
Barrow	Etheridge	Lungren, Daniel E.
Bartlett	Farr	Lynch
Barton (TX)	Fattah	Maloney
Bean	Filner	Manzullo
Berkley	Flake	Marchant
Berman	Forbes	Markey (CO)
Biggert	Fortenberry	Markey (MA)
Bilbray	Foster	Marshall
Bilirakis	Fox	Matheson
Bishop (NY)	Frank (MA)	Matsui
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (NY)
Blumenauer	Gallely	McCaul
Blunt	Garamendi	McClintock
Boccieri	Garrett (NJ)	McCollum
Boehner	Gerlach	McCotter
Bonner	Giffords	McDermott
Bono Mack	Gonzalez	McGovern
Boozman	Goodlatte	McHenry
Boren	Gordon (TN)	McIntyre
Boswell	Granger	McKeon
Boucher	Graves	McMahon
Boustany	Grayson	McMorris
Boyd	Green, Al	Rodgers
Braley (IA)	Green, Gene	McNerney
Bright	Griffith	Meek (FL)
Broun (GA)	Guthrie	Meeks (NY)
Brown (SC)	Hall (NY)	Melancon
Brown-Waite,	Hall (TX)	Mica
Ginny	Halvorson	Michaud
Buchanan	Hare	Miller (FL)
Burgess	Harper	Miller (MI)
Burton (IN)	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)
Butterfield	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary
Buyer	Heinrich	Miller, George
Calvert	Heller	Minnick
Camp	Hensarling	Mitchell
Campbell	Hergert	Moore (KS)
Cantor	Herseth Sandlin	Moran (KS)
Capito	Hill	Murphy (CT)
Capps	Himes	Murphy (NY)
Cardoza	Hinojosa	Murphy, Patrick
Carnahan	Hirono	Murphy, Tim
Carney	Hodes	Myrick
Carson (IN)	Holden	Nadler (NY)
Carter	Holt	Napolitano
Cassidy	Honda	Neugebauer
Castle	Hoyer	Nunes
Chaffetz	Hunter	Nye
Chandler	Inslee	Oberstar
Childers	Issa	Obey
Chu	Jackson (IL)	Olson
Clarke	Jackson Lee	Oliver
Clay	(TX)	Ortiz
Cleaver	Jenkins	Owens
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Coffman (CO)	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor (AZ)
Cohen	Johnson, Sam	Paul
Cole	Jones	Paulsen
Conaway	Jordan (OH)	Payne
Connolly (VA)	Kagen	Pence
Conyers	Kanjorski	Perlmuter
Cooper	Kennedy	Perriello
Costello	Kildee	Peters
Courtney	Kilroy	Peterson
Crenshaw	Kind	Petri
Crowley	King (IA)	Pingree (ME)
Cuellar	King (NY)	Pitts
Culberson	Kingston	Platts
Dahlkemper	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Poe (TX)
Davis (CA)	Klein (FL)	Polis (CO)
Davis (KY)	Kline (MN)	Pomeroy
Davis (TN)	Kratovil	Posey
DeFazio	Kucinich	Price (NC)
DeGette	Lamborn	Putnam
Delahunt	Lance	Quigley
DeLauro	Langevin	Radanovich
Dent	Larsen (WA)	Rahall
Deutch	Larson (CT)	Rangel
Diaz-Balart, L.	Latham	Rehberg
Diaz-Balart, M.	LaTourette	Reichert
Dicks	Latta	

[Roll No. 221]

YEAS—370

Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner

Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry

Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—60

Barrett (SC)
Becerra
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Cao
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Coble
Costa
Cumming
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Dingell
Fallin
Fleming
Fudge
Gingrey (GA)

Gohmert
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Higgins
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Inglis
Israel
Johnson (IL)
Kaptur
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kirk
Kissell
Kosmas
Lipinski
Mack
Maffei
Mollohan
Moore (WI)

Moran (VA)
Neal (MA)
Pascarell
Price (GA)
Rohrabacher
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Shadegg
Simpson
Souder
Speier
Stupak
Tiahrt
Towns
Wamp
Weiner
Woolsey
Young (FL)

□ 1858

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1963. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance to caregivers of veterans, to improve the provision of health care to veterans, and for other purposes.

HONORING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF SAM HOUSTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1103, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1103, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 375, nays 0, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 222]

YEAS—375

Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boccheri
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Dahlkemper

Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)

Kagen
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilroy
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungrén, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Nunes

Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Paulsen
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (NC)
Putnam
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rooney

Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner

Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—55

Barrett (SC)
Becerra
Berry
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Cao
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Coble
Costa
Cumming
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
Dingell
Fallin
Fleming
Fudge
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert

Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Higgins
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Inglis
Israel
Johnson (IL)
Kaptur
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kirk
Kissell
Lipinski
Mack
Maffei
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)

Neal (MA)
Pascarell
Price (GA)
Rohrabacher
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Shadegg
Simpson
Souder
Stupak
Tiahrt
Towns
Wamp
Weiner
Woolsey
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes left to vote.

□ 1907

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Honoring the life and accomplishments of Sam Houston for his historical contributions to the expansion of the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEVE GOODMAN POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4861, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4861.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 371, nays 0, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

YEAS—371

Ackerman	Davis (TN)	Kilroy
Aderholt	DeFazio	Kind
Adler (NJ)	DeGette	King (IA)
Akin	Delahunt	King (NY)
Alexander	DeLauro	Kingston
Altmire	Dent	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Andrews	Deutch	Klein (FL)
Arcuri	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kline (MN)
Austria	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kosmas
Baca	Dicks	Kratovil
Bachmann	Doggett	Kucinich
Bachus	Donnelly (IN)	Lamborn
Baird	Doyle	Lance
Baldwin	Dreier	Langevin
Barrow	Driehaus	Larsen (WA)
Bartlett	Duncan	Larson (CT)
Barton (TX)	Edwards (MD)	Latham
Bean	Edwards (TX)	LaTourrette
Berkley	Ehlers	Latta
Berman	Ellison	Lee (CA)
Biggert	Ellsworth	Lee (NY)
Billbray	Emerson	Levin
Bilirakis	Engel	Lewis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Lewis (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Etheridge	Linder
Bishop (UT)	Farr	LoBiondo
Blackburn	Fattah	Loebsack
Blumenauer	Filner	Lofgren, Zoe
Blunt	Flake	Lowe
Bocciari	Forbes	Lucas
Boehner	Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer
Bonner	Foster	Lujan
Bono Mack	Fox	Lummis
Boozman	Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel E.
Boren	Frelinghuysen	Lynch
Boswell	Gallely	Maloney
Boucher	Garamendi	Manzullo
Boustany	Garrett (NJ)	Marchant
Boyd	Gerlach	Markey (CO)
Braley (IA)	Giffords	Markey (MA)
Bright	Gonzalez	Marshall
Broun (GA)	Goodlatte	Matheson
Brown (SC)	Gordon (TN)	Matsui
Brown-Waite,	Granger	McCarthy (CA)
Ginny	Graves	McCarthy (NY)
Buchanan	Grayson	McCaul
Burgess	Green, Al	McClintock
Burton (IN)	Green, Gene	McCollum
Butterfield	Griffith	McCotter
Calvert	Guthrie	McDermott
Camp	Hall (NY)	McGovern
Campbell	Hall (TX)	McHenry
Cantor	Halvorson	McIntyre
Capito	Hare	McKeon
Capps	Harper	McMahon
Cardoza	Hastings (FL)	McMorris
Carnahan	Hastings (WA)	McNerney
Carney	Heinrich	Meek (FL)
Carson (IN)	Heller	Meeks (NY)
Carter	Hensarling	Melancon
Cassidy	Hergert	Mica
Castle	Herseth Sandlin	Michaud
Chaffetz	Hill	Miller (FL)
Chandler	Himes	Miller (MI)
Childers	Hinojosa	Miller (NC)
Chu	Hirono	Miller, Gary
Clarke	Hodes	Miller, George
Clay	Holden	Minnick
Cleaver	Holt	Mitchell
Clyburn	Honda	Moore (KS)
Coffman (CO)	Hoyer	Moran (KS)
Cohen	Hunter	Murphy (CT)
Cole	Inslee	Murphy (NY)
Conaway	Issa	Murphy, Patrick
Connolly (VA)	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Tim
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Myrick
Cooper	(TX)	Nadler (NY)
Costa	Jenkins	Napolitano
Costello	Johnson (GA)	Neugebauer
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	Nunes
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Nye
Crowley	Jones	Oberstar
Cuellar	Jordan (OH)	Obey
Culberson	Kagen	Oliver
Dahlkemper	Kanjorski	Ortiz
Davis (CA)	Kennedy	
Davis (KY)	Kildee	

Owens	Roybal-Allard
Pallone	Royce
Pastor (AZ)	Ryan (OH)
Paul	Ryan (WI)
Paulsen	Salazar
Payne	Sánchez, Linda T.
Pence	Sarbanes
Perlmutter	Scalise
Perriello	Schakowsky
Peters	Schauer
Peterson	Schiff
Petri	Schmidt
Pingree (ME)	Schock
Pitts	Schrader
Platts	Schwartz
Poe (TX)	Scott (GA)
Polis (CO)	Scott (VA)
Pomeroy	Sensenbrenner
Posey	Serrano
Price (NC)	Sessions
Putnam	Sestak
Quigley	Shea-Porter
Radanovich	Sherman
Rahall	Shimkus
Rangel	Shuler
Rehberg	Shuster
Reichert	Sires
Reyes	Skelton
Richardson	Slaughter
Rodriguez	Smith (NE)
Roe (TN)	Smith (NJ)
Rogers (AL)	Smith (TX)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (WA)
Rogers (MI)	Snyder
Rooney	Space
Ros-Lehtinen	Speier
Roskam	Spratt
Ross	Stark
Rothman (NJ)	

NOT VOTING—59

Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Neal (MA)
Becerra	Grijalva	Olson
Berry	Gutierrez	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Harman	Price (GA)
Brady (TX)	Higgins	Rohrabacher
Brown, Corrine	Hinche	Ruppersberger
Buyer	Hoekstra	Rush
Cao	Inglis	Sanchez, Loretta
Capuano	Israel	Shadegg
Castor (FL)	Johnson (IL)	Simpson
Coble	Kaptur	Souder
Cummings	Kilpatrick (MI)	Stupak
Davis (AL)	Kirk	Tiaht
Davis (IL)	Kissell	Towns
Dingell	Lipinski	Wamp
Fallin	Mack	Waters
Fleming	Maffei	Weiner
Franks (AZ)	Mollohan	Woolsey
Fudge	Moore (WI)	Young (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Moran (VA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes left to vote.

□ 1914

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I was unable to attend to several votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on final passage of H.R. 4543, "aye" on final passage of H. Res. 1103, and "aye" on final passage of H.R. 4861.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for votes in the House Chamber today. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 221, 222, and 223.

ARIZONA'S IMMIGRATION LAW

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, last Friday, Arizona State Governor Jan Brewer signed into law Arizona State bill 1070 which would require police officers to act on "reasonable suspicion" to determine a person's immigration status and turn them over to ICE. President Obama referred to the law as "misguided."

Forcing Federal immigration duties onto local law enforcement officers is not the right way to fix the broken immigration system. It violates the presumption of innocence granted to everyone by the Constitution of the United States.

In fact, I as a Member of Congress because of the color of my skin may be approached in Arizona and be asked for my legal documentation. They may question whether it's authentic or not authentic.

This law is unjust and will only lead to an increase in racial profiling. We must never forget that America was a nation founded by immigrants.

I call on all of us to consider a national boycott of all industries in Arizona and to wear a band on our sleeves to protest against this unjust law and to show that this is not the American way. We must not tolerate unjust laws inspired by racism and hate.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2499, THE PUERTO RICO DEMOCRACY ACT

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, the House will consider H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act. I am proud to support this bipartisan bill which would allow the residents of Puerto Rico the opportunity to voice their opinions on the status of the island's relationship to the mainland, to the United States, through a federally sanctioned plebiscite.

Nearly 4 million U.S. citizens currently reside in Puerto Rico and my congressional district in South Florida is home to nearly 20,000 American citizens of Puerto Rican descent.

Although Puerto Rico has been a U.S. territory for more than 100 years, Congress has never asked those American citizens residing in Puerto Rico to express their opinion on the territory's political status. This bill does not exclude any viable status option nor does it provide for a change in status to be automatically implemented. Instead, the bill initiates a long overdue process of consultation with the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Puerto Rico Democracy Act when it comes to a vote later this week.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4753

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 4753, the Stationary Source Regulations Delay Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY MONTH

(Mr. McNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McNERNEY. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize April as Occupational Therapy Month, an important occasion to acknowledge the contributions that occupational therapists and occupational therapy assistants make every day to help people live healthier lives.

Occupational therapy professionals work tirelessly with people of all ages to them prevent injuries, recover after an accident, and adjust their lives to new physical challenges they may experience. In my home State, occupational therapy professionals provide essential health and rehabilitation services to thousands of Californians each year. In facilities throughout my district like Lodi Memorial Hospital and the Kaiser Foundation Hospital in Manteca, skilled occupational therapy practitioners help my constituents achieve functional independence every day.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting April as Occupational Therapy Month and in applauding the work of occupational therapists and occupational therapy assistants throughout the country.

ASSESSING NEW HEALTH CARE LAW

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Madam Speaker, last week the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' Office of the Actuary released a memo estimating the financial effects of the new health care law. Not surprisingly, they found that costs will increase and access to care will be threatened as this legislation is implemented over the next 10 years.

According to the independent report, "Providers for whom Medicare constitutes a substantive portion of their business could find it difficult to remain profitable and, absent legislative intervention, might end their participation in the program—possibly jeopardizing access to care for beneficiaries." Put simply, the new law will force many doctors to stop seeing Medicare patients, leaving seniors in my district out in the cold.

Additionally, the report claims that "total national health expenditures in

the United States during 2010 to 2019 would increase by about 0.9 percent. The additional demand for health services could lead to price increases, cost-shifting, and/or changes in providers' willingness to treat patients with low-reimbursement health coverage."

The new health care law will drive up costs and make it more difficult for many Americans, especially seniors, to get the care they need.

REMEMBERING SERGEANT JASON A. SANTORA

(Mr. BISHOP of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart following the loss of Army Sergeant Jason A. Santora, who was killed this past Friday fighting Taliban insurgents in Afghanistan.

Sergeant Santora was from Farmingville, New York, in my district of eastern Long Island. He graduated from Sachem High School in 2003 and joined the Army in 2006, becoming a member of the elite Army Rangers.

He was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment at Fort Benning. Although only 25 years old, he was serving his fourth tour of duty. He served two in Iraq and was 2 months into his second tour as a team leader in Afghanistan's Logar Province.

Sergeant Santora's unit was on a mission to target a compound believed to be a Taliban terror nest when it was ambushed from multiple directions by heavy machine-gun fire. He died of wounds sustained in that gunfire and was posthumously awarded the Purple Heart, Bronze Star and Meritorious Service Medal. The commanding officer of the 75th Ranger Regiment honored his courage by describing Sergeant Santora as a warrior, a true patriot, and an absolute hero who made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our Nation.

Madam Speaker, during the difficult days ahead, my thoughts and prayers are with Sergeant Santora's family—his father, Gary; his mother, Theresa; and his sister, Gina. On behalf of New York's First Congressional District, I thank Sergeant Santora for his service, his gallantry, and his selfless commitment. A grateful nation will always remember his sacrifice and honor his memory.

NATIONAL AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today because April is National Autism Awareness Month. Autism affects nearly one in every 110 children born in the United States and is the fastest growing developmental disability.

With approximately 1.5 million Americans currently living with au-

tism, we have a responsibility to support research and provide resources to support those living with autism. Studies have shown that early diagnosis and treatment can lead to better outcomes for children with autism. In fact, early identification and treatment can help reduce the symptoms of autism, increase progress for children as they enter school and reduce the need for more intensive support in the future.

But to do that, we must work hard to increase the awareness of autism across the country. That's why I'm proud to be an original cosponsor of House Resolution 1033, which officially designates April as Autism Awareness Month. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the days and months ahead on both sides of the aisle to bringing awareness to this important effort going forward.

RECOGNIZING 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF WHBC RADIO

(Mr. BOCCIERI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOCCIERI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 85th anniversary of WHBC-AM Radio, the oldest radio station in Stark County and Canton, Ohio.

Founded in 1925, WHBC was the first Catholic station in the country. It later changed formats and quickly became one of the shining, trusted voices of northeast Ohio. In the golden age of broadcasting, parents and children would gather around the radio and listen to WHBC.

Bing Crosby's music was soothing and simple. Dragnet was exciting and fun. A father and son could listen to a ball game and the Indians win their last World Series in 1948.

Today, WHBC is as diverse a station as the citizens of northeast Ohio. WHBC gives people the facts, and its programming gets to the heart of who we are as northeast Ohioans. Fans can listen to their favorite teams in the car, or as I like to do, turn down the television and listen to WHBC's play-by-play. I listen to WHBC because it's a quality radio station and has maintained that standard for 85 years.

Congratulations.

REPORT ON HEALTH CARE REFORM LEGISLATION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, throughout the health care reform debate, I focused on four tenets. We needed to improve affordability, access, quality and choice. I said when the bill passed that it did not fulfill those requirements.

It gives me no pleasure to show you where the actuary report for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services agrees with me.

Affordability. “By 2011 and 2012, the initial \$5 billion in Federal funding for high risk pools will be exhausted, resulting in substantial premium increases to sustain the program.”

Access. The report projected that Medicare cuts would drive about 15 percent of hospitals and other institutional providers into the red, “possibly jeopardizing access” to care for seniors.

Quality. Some 18 million uninsured are estimated to go on Medicaid for their primary coverage, which will fail to provide meaningful access.

And finally, Choice. “We estimate that in 2017, when the provisions will be fully phased in, enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans will be lower by about 50 percent.”

If you chose Medicare Advantage, half of you will be out of luck.

TWO SEALS NOT GUILTY—THIRD SHOULD BE ACQUITTED TOO

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, two of our three Navy SEALs responsible for catching one of the worst terrorists in the world—Ahmed Hasim Abed—have been acquitted of all alleged assault charges related to the terrorist's capture.

Abed planned the 2004 ambush and murder of four Blackwater security guards in Fallujah, Iraq. These Americans were set on fire, mutilated, dragged through the streets and hung from a bridge over the Euphrates River.

Our SEALs captured this crybaby terrorist. He later accused them of punching him. Two SEALs have been acquitted—the other should be acquitted as well.

Last week I visited the Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland, and met with 10 amazing, intense midshipmen from my congressional district in Texas. The remarkable class of 2010 is expected to graduate over a thousand midshipmen, but only 27 will be selected for the SEALs program.

Our SEALs are the best that we have. We are forever indebted to these great warriors for their service to American freedom. We should give the Navy SEALs that captured Abed medals and send them out there to capture another one.

And that's just the way it is.

ARIZONA'S IMMIGRATION LAW

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, what are the people in Arizona supposed to do? What are the people in Texas supposed to do? Or New Mexico?

I hear this rhetoric on the floor here about how the law in Arizona is unconstitutional. I've looked at that. I don't

think its unconstitutional. And I think they have an obligation to protect the people of Arizona from the drug terrorists that are coming across the border in droves. They're bringing drugs illegally into the United States. We've got illegal aliens coming across in droves in the Arizona area into the United States and the government of the United States is doing absolutely nothing.

The border between us and Mexico is 1,980 miles long. We've talked about securing that border for a long time, and we have not done it. Those border States have to deal with this on a daily basis and the law enforcement agencies down there have a Herculean job to deal with.

And so I would just like to say to my colleagues, I don't think it's racial profiling for them to stop people that they suspect of being here illegally who may be dealing in drug trafficking and who may be threatening the lives of people down there because the crime rate is going out of sight. Let's support the people of Arizona and the law enforcement people down there. They have a right to make sure that they're safe.

□ 1930

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

GEERT WILDERS AND NOW “SOUTH PARK” ARE DENIED FREEDOM OF SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, freedom of speech is under attack in the West today, brought to you by the same radical Islamic terrorists who use religion to kill in the name of hate. I've talked about Dutch lawmaker Geert Wilders, who is on trial in Amsterdam for insulting Islam. You see, he made a documentary movie about real terrorist acts and real radical Islamic clerics encouraging violence in the name of hate. Instead of being grateful for shining a light on this problem, the Dutch Government is putting Geert Wilders on trial. He is charged with discrimination and incitement to hatred, all for showing the world how radical Islamic clerics discriminate and incite people to hatred. Wilders spoke the truth, and he got charged with a crime in his own country.

The Dutch Ministry of Justice says it doesn't matter if Wilders was telling the truth. The Dutch court says it's irrelevant whether Wilders' assertions actually are correct. What is relevant to the court is Wilders cannot speak

freely about radical Islam because it might offend somebody. In the Netherlands the truth is no longer welcome in a court of law.

Geert Wilders now lives under a threat of a 5-year prison sentence from his own government for freedom of speech for the right to tell the truth. His trial is set to resume in July, the trial where the Dutch court says truth doesn't matter. It only matters if Wilders' words hurt somebody's feelings. You see, Dutch law is intolerant of people who are intolerant of violence in the name of Islam. And that's a recipe for disaster. By denying free, truthful speech, the Dutch Government by its actions is encouraging radicals to incite violence worldwide.

Dutch filmmaker Theo van Gogh, grandnephew of the legendary artist Vincent van Gogh, also made a film the radical clerics didn't like. His was about Islam's harsh treatment of women and how they brutalized women and used them as property. The result, van Gogh was murdered in the streets of Amsterdam as he rode his bicycle to work. His partner in the film, now a former member of Parliament, fled the country in fear.

Kurt Westergaard is one of the 12 artists who drew a satirical cartoon about the prophet Mohammed. So radical clerics incited their followers to murder people in the streets around the globe. Most of the clerics admitted later they had never seen the Mohammed cartoons. And Westergaard now lives in hiding under an armed guard. So much for freedom of the press and freedom of speech.

Now the threats of violence are spreading to the United States. The popular animated TV program “South Park” insults everybody. It's a comedy program that uses satire to make social statements. “South Park's” creators, Matt Stone and Trey Parker, did a series of episodes that insulted various world religions, including Islam. The 200th episode broadcast depicted all the founders of the major religions. Mohammed was dressed in a bear suit because Islam forbids its followers to depict the religion's founders.

One radical Islamic Web site called “Revolutionary Muslim” is upset about the program, so they issued threats saying “South Park” creators Stone and Parker would end up like Theo van Gogh, in other words, dead. And they put up the crime scene photos of van Gogh with his throat slit and a knife protruding from his chest. They also gave out the TV network address of Comedy Central in New York, addresses for Parker and Stone's Los Angeles production company, and their residences. The radical Web site said they published the addresses so people could go out there and protest. Yeah, right.

The trouble is we have seen worldwide how these radicals protest. They kill people. Because of the threats of violence and fear for the safety of everyone from the receptionist to the series creators, Comedy Central censored

and spiked a follow-up program. Free speech was intimidated again by radical Islamics. These terrorists are being handed veto power over free speech through threats of violence and murder.

No charges have been brought in the United States against the author of these radical Islamic Web sites. Meanwhile, Geert Wilders is still on trial in the Netherlands for warning the world about these haters for speaking the truth.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SIMPLIFY THE TAX CODE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to speak on behalf of America's small business owners and small business owners in western Pennsylvania who have recently finished filing their taxes with the Federal Government and have struggled over the past year to provide goods, services, and jobs during this recession.

As we all know, April is tax month for American citizens. And as a member of the Small Business Committee, I had the opportunity to hear testimony by Internal Revenue Service Commissioner Douglas Shulman on April 14. Commissioner Shulman walked through the service and disclosures provided by the IRS during tax preparation season. He described outreach being performed on many levels to aid small businesses in complying with the convoluted tax system they faced as American job creators.

While the IRS has a responsibility to use its funding to conduct outreach and facilitate voluntary compliance with tax laws, it's Congress that has the responsibility to hear the calls of America's small businesses for more streamlined and simplified tax regulations.

The outreach and disclosure by the IRS is certainly helpful. However, I would prefer to see it become less necessary. If America's small business owners were not spending so much valuable time deciphering codes and regulations, they could be growing their businesses to earn profits, create jobs, and lead America back to prosperity just as they have always done through past recessions. Less time spent complying with the Tax Code would increase tax revenue by allowing small businesses to focus more time on running their businesses, meanwhile saving the IRS time and money in outreach and instruction on their intri-

cate rules and requirements for every small business in America.

I hope that by April of next year Congress can find the time to work on behalf of America's small businesses and simplify the Tax Code.

VISIT TO WALTER REED ARMY MEDICAL CENTER AND BETHESDA NAVAL HOSPITAL WITH JEROME AND RACHEL LEE AND LEX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Madam Speaker, on April 12 of this year I had the honor and privilege of visiting the wounded warriors at Walter Reed Army Medical Center and Bethesda Naval Hospital with Jerome and Rachel Lee and their dog Lex. The Lees' son Dustin, a marine, was killed in Iraq in 2005. Lex was his military working dog and was severely injured in the attack.

The Lees are a remarkable family. They continue to visit the wounded warriors that return from Iraq and Afghanistan. This is how they remember their son. And they gave for this country a very special young man. The interaction between Lex and the wounded was amazing. To see these brave men and women smile at the sight of Lex was truly a touching experience for me personally. Lex is one of them and continues to fight through his injuries. The shrapnel still lies in his back. In fact, Lex has been awarded the Purple Heart.

The Lees also had a wonderful experience meeting retired United States Senator Bob Dole as he was recovering from an accident. Senator Dole was kind enough to invite the Lee family into his room at Walter Reed and speak with them for several minutes. It was truly remarkable as I watched former Senator Dole, a war hero himself, as he pet and bonded with Lex.

I would like to thank the Humane Society, who sponsored this trip for the Lee family, Connie Whitfield, wife of United States Congressman ED WHITFIELD, who joined us on this tour. They, Mrs. Whitfield, and the United States Humane Society, went above and beyond for this family.

There are many other people to thank, but I would like to especially thank my dear friend Major General Mike Regner, who was very instrumental in uniting the Lees and Lex. Major General Regner is currently serving in Afghanistan, but I would like to note that he was remembered during the Lees' visit at Bethesda and Walter Reed. And the family is very grateful to him. Major General Regner helped them adopt Lex, their son's best friend and partner.

Madam Speaker, because of that trip that I took with the Lees to Bethesda and Walter Reed, and the number of young men and women both at Walter Reed and Bethesda who have been se-

verely wounded for this country, I would like to close, as I normally do on the floor of the House, I would ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. I will ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I will ask God in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. And I will ask God to please bless the House and Senate here in Washington that we would do what is right in the eyes of God for today's generation, but also tomorrow's generation. I will ask God to give strength, wisdom, and courage to President Obama that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for today's generation and tomorrow's generation.

Madam Speaker, I will ask three times, God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DISPELLING THE MYTHS SURROUNDING H.R. 2499

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 2499, the Puerto Rico Democracy Act, I would like to take some time this evening to dispel some of the myths that surround this legislation.

The Puerto Rico Democracy Act provides for a formal consultation with the people of Puerto Rico regarding the island's political status. H.R. 2499 authorizes the Government of Puerto Rico to conduct an initial plebiscite. Eligible voters would be asked whether they wish to maintain the current political status or to have a different status. If the majority favors the current status, then the Government of Puerto Rico would be authorized to ask voters this question again at 8-year intervals. On the other hand, if a majority of the voters favor a different status, the Government of Puerto Rico would be authorized to conduct a second plebiscite among the three nonterritorial status options recognized under U.S. and international law.

What are those three options? They are, number one, independence; two, statehood; and, three, sovereignty in association with the U.S., which is commonly known as free association.

Opponents of this bill, of H.R. 2499, contend that the two-step process stacks the deck against the current status and in favor of statehood. This is simply not the case, Madam Speaker. H.R. 2499 does not exclude nor favor any status option. Under this legislation, the purpose of the first plebiscite is clear: to inform Congress whether the majority of Puerto Ricans consent to the current political status.

□ 1945

Only if a majority of voters expresses its desire to change the current status is a second vote mandated on the three alternatives: independence, statehood, and free association.

This two-step process was recommended by the President's task force on Puerto Rico's status. This task force was initiated under the Clinton administration, and it was finalized by the Bush administration. The task force called upon the expertise of 16 Federal agencies in recommending a fair process for consulting with the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico.

Opponents of H.R. 2499 propose that the option of an enhanced commonwealth should be included as a status option during the second plebiscite. Well, this enhanced commonwealth, as envisioned by the bill's detractors, perpetuates the false hope that Puerto Ricans can have the best of both worlds:

They can have U.S. citizenship and national sovereignty;

They will receive all Federal funds and will have the power to veto those laws with which it disagrees.

If included as a viable option, an enhanced commonwealth proposal would permanently empower Puerto Rico to nullify Federal laws and court jurisdiction and to enter into an international organization and trade agreements, all while being under the military and financial protection of the United States.

It is no surprise that this proposal has been soundly rejected as a viable option by the U.S. Department of Justice, by the State Department, by the Clinton administration, and by the Bush administration.

Another misguided concern surrounding H.R. 2499 is that the bill fails to include an "English only" provision. It is premature to discuss this matter until the conclusion of the first and second plebiscites. H.R. 2499 does not require Congress to admit Puerto Rico as a State nor even to set the statehood process in motion if a majority of voters ultimately chooses statehood. If the people of Puerto Rico express a preference for statehood and if Congress is inclined to act upon that preference, further Federal legislation would be required. That legislation and not H.R. 2499 would be the appropriate vehicle in which to address any potential language-related condition on Puerto Rico's accession to statehood.

I would like now to change focus and to highlight the overwhelming bipar-

tisan support behind H.R. 2499. Introduced by the Resident Commissioner, this bill enjoys the backing of more than 180 cosponsors from both political parties, and it is strongly supported by Puerto Rico Governor Luis Fortuno, a former House colleague, who introduced similar versions of this bill in the past. This bill is also endorsed by numerous leaders in the Puerto Rican legislature and local government, including the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and many other local officials.

Given the strong support, Madam Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill when it comes to a floor vote later this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PASS COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, over this weekend, the Governor of Arizona raised up the idea of prayer, and in her remarks, she indicated that she prayed for strength and that she prayed for our State.

I rise today to pray for Arizona, for this Nation, and for those who would think a law that was signed by the Arizona Governor raises any level of constitutionality. Yet I agree with the Governor of Arizona. They have been waiting very long, and there is a crisis that is necessary to address.

Madam Speaker, many of us on this side of the aisle have tried over and over again. Former President George Bush, in the last administration, tried, but that's where reasonable minds will disagree.

So I'd ask the Governor to ask her own party:

Why do they fail to stand up and be counted on a fair, comprehensive immigration reform proposal that, in years past, included border security as well as the opportunity for access to legalization?

So the actions this past week are a travesty, hypocritical, and not sincere because you'd ask the question: What is a legal contact? What are the law enforcement authorities of the State of Arizona to do in the midst of the work that they have in protecting the community from the array of criminal acts by anyone regardless of their background? There are burglaries, thefts, and rapes, robberies and actions that require the intervention of State and local law enforcement.

What is a legal contact? Is it a person who is rushing his pregnant wife to the

hospital and who is stopping to ask a police officer, Will you lead me through the lights to the hospital? Is that a legal contact?

What is a determination of reasonable probability? Is it brown skin? Is it someone who is dressed in yard clothes? What is the determination of reasonableness? There is no answer to that other than it is patently unconstitutional.

Yes, I want comprehensive immigration reform, which is a term that many have demonized—you have to run away from it now—but we in Texas have lived with this for a very long time, the men and women of all economic levels—the business community, the non-profit community, the faith community. The Houston-Galveston Diocese, our cardinal, the cardinal in the Houston area, has raised his voice, along with many faith leaders, to say that now is the time for real comprehensive immigration reform.

I am ashamed of the law that was written and signed, because it bears no fruit. Of course, there are law enforcement officers in the region, and certainly, I'm not from the area whose only voice is to claim airtime and to shout ridiculous comments: I can lock them up. Anybody, I can lock up. This is not to say that there is not empathy and sympathy for the borders in Arizona. There is a need now for comprehensive immigration reform for Arizona, for New Mexico, for California, for Texas—for all of America.

Though, I will tell you, Madam Speaker, if a young person comes to me in my district who came here from a foreign country—in this instance, France—who has been in our school system, who did not know the process and who is now unstated but who has never been in trouble and who is going through school—he is an immigrant, but unfortunately, status—then he is no less than the immigrants from Ireland, than the immigrants from Italy and the immigrants from places elsewhere who came to this country and who helped to build it and to make it a better place. Maybe he is no better than the immigrants who came in shackles, like myself, and their ancestors, who came in the bottom of the belly of a slave boat; but we found a way to regularize them. This Congress must find a way to regularize this process and all of the families who are huddled in fear, who have never perpetrated a crime.

I want to thank the leadership of this House and the leadership of the Senate, both of which are courageous enough to take the battering and the abuse of those who misuse the Constitution and who believe they are doing something. They are not.

Should they be responded to? Madam Speaker, they should. My answer is that we pass right now comprehensive immigration reform to save America, to save our dignity, to save the Constitution, and to stand for the values we believe in.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF MANDATED HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTER. I thank you for yielding, Madam Speaker, and I thank you for this night so that we can get together and talk about something that is still on the minds of almost everybody in the United States because, quite frankly, even though this bill has passed both Houses of Congress and even though it has been signed into law by the President, the overwhelming majority of the people in this country are waking up every day to find out there is something else that nobody knew was in this bill and are finding out about something else that is being imposed upon the States and on the people of this country that nobody knew was going to happen.

It's because it was a 2,400-page bill, or something like that, which nobody ever read, and it was voted on and passed when there were people who were responsible for its contents who couldn't tell you what was in it. In fact, I believe the Speaker of this House made a statement: We need to pass this bill so we can learn what's in it. That's kind of when the worrying started in this country. It was when people started hearing those kinds of things from our leadership.

So we are now at a point where there has been a lawsuit—and we talked about this. I believe it was last week or the week before last. We talked about the fact that a lawsuit has been filed by the attorneys general of multiple States in this country. Well, this is a growing process. When we last talked, there were 20 States that had joined in this lawsuit, and here we are on April 26, 2010, and we have 22 States. So two more States have joined in this process, and there is at least the possibility that we could add, maybe, another five or 10 States to this lawsuit.

So, right now, as it stands right now, it is my understanding—and I can be corrected. I do not claim to be a great historical scholar of the Supreme Court of the United States. I have read cases, which was required by my profession, and I have taken constitutional law in law school. I had great constitutional law debates among my law school colleagues when we were young, would-be lawyers. In my practice of law and as a judge, I've had some periphery of the constitutional requirements that are set out by the Supreme Court, but I don't claim to be an expert on it.

I am told that, since the Court started, this is probably the largest single group of States to have filed suit on behalf of their individual States and to have joined together on an issue. Now, I may be wrong about that, and I certainly will be corrected if somebody wants to correct me, but it's close.

We've got 50 States in this Union, and 22 of them are already in this lawsuit. So, if we pick up three more States, we'll have half the States in the Union involved in this lawsuit. Even 22 is really kind of a mind-boggling number. It also represents 44.56 percent of the population of the United States.

So, within these red States that you see on this map here—those dark States as compared to the light States, if anybody is still watching in black and white—that represents almost half the population of this country who are asking the question, and the question is very simple:

Does the Constitution grant Congress the power to mandate the coverage that's set out in this bill?

Now, that is a big question, but it focuses down to a much narrower issue. There are more issues here, but the most narrow issue is if Congress has the authority to mandate that people who are living within the continental United States must buy certain products, namely, health insurance, from designated sellers of that product, which will mean some insurance company. The issue is that they have to, that they cannot have an option, that they cannot say "no," and that if they say "no" that they can be fined under the IRS Code and can be required to pay up to a \$2,000 fine for not purchasing health care. There are some ranges in that. The fine can be less, but if it's \$1, it's a fine punishing you for not buying a product.

Now, the great debate is broadly about the Ninth and 10th Amendments, but it is specifically about the commerce clause as set out in the Constitution of the United States. So every attorney general in every one of the States you see here—and this is a pretty nice cross-section. We've got the east coast, one on the west coast, a whole bunch of southern States, a whole bunch of western States, and a whole bunch of midwestern States which are in this fight, and they are asking a real simple question about the commerce clause.

□ 2000

But as I said, it's like we wake up every morning and we have new things to talk about, about this plan.

A recent Center for Medicine and Medicare Services has come up with some new findings on this bill. Let's examine these together. I'm glad to have my friend, Mr. BURTON here, who is going to join me and we will talk about some of this stuff.

Twenty million Americans who currently can't afford health insurance will buy a policy under duress from the threat of fine and IRS action. This is what they found: Four million Americans will still not be able to buy and will be fined \$33 billion a year and still not have health insurance. Fourteen million Americans will lose their employer-sponsored health insurance as a direct result of this new law. Twenty-three million Americans will still have

no health insurance coverage in 2019 after the bill is fully implemented. And 21 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States will be spent on health care after the law is implemented, which is higher than if Congress had done nothing. So if nothing would have happened, we spent 21 percent of the gross domestic product.

So we were sitting here, and the first thing we were told is the reason we need to pass health care is we need to get a cheaper product. I mean, we need to save money. We need to reduce the deficit, reduce the debt.

Well, we haven't reduced the spending because it's going to be 21 percent of the gross domestic product, which is larger than it is today, and it's estimated it's larger than it would have been if we hadn't done anything.

So these are facts that sort of jar you into reality that we have got a product that every American sitting around the coffee shop tomorrow morning ought to be talking about, that everybody in every office building, on every farm and ranch, and every small business in America ought to be asking questions about what has become the new law of the land.

I think the attorneys general of the multiple States in this country, they started asking these questions as the process was going through, and as they discovered nightmare after nightmare after nightmare as it pertains to the States, they started getting rattled and they started to say, This can't be. We can't be imposing this kind of will under the Commerce Clause.

So I think it's important that we look at the Ninth and the 10th Amendment and the Commerce Clause, and I'm going to start off, and then we're going to talk about some constitutional law here with my good friend DAN BURTON. We're going to see how we figure this.

I think everybody out there learned in school we have a Constitution and we have amendments to that Constitution, which are just part of the Constitution. They just came at a different time. And the amendments have a lot to do with individual rights to liberty in this country. And when our Founding Fathers were looking at this project and what they were doing, they were going from sovereign States. The people of Virginia considered themselves—Virginia was a sovereign State. That meant a sovereignty-laden State. And they were meeting in Philadelphia to see how much sovereignty they would surrender and what they would create in the form of a Federal republic.

And remember what Benjamin Franklin said when asked as he walked out the door what kind of a government they had created, and he said, A republic, if you can keep it, because it depends upon those who were given that gift to keep that republic, which means it has some basic concepts which our Founding Fathers were ingenious about creating, and one of them

was the balance of power, that there would be offsetting power between the three branches of government which would balance out the power so no overwhelming power would lie in any one branch of the government.

There are three branches: the executive, which is the President and all the various executive agencies of the government; and then the legislative, which is the House and Senate; and then the judiciary, which is the entire judicial system of the United States, capped off by the Supreme Court of the United States.

So when they wrote this, they wrote the Ninth and the 10th Amendments. And the Ninth Amendment says, "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others," other rights, "retained by the people."

Because our Founding Fathers took the position which learned people of that time were debating and putting forth that the rights that are set out in our Bill of Rights and the other rights that are defined in our Constitution are, first and foremost, the rights of the people. Each individual person has those unalienable rights.

So when they sat down and they started to put this thing together, they said, now, any rights we didn't talk about still belong to the people. So just because they didn't write it down in the Constitution—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and all the ones you learned in school—there are more rights than that because those rights lie with the people.

The 10th Amendment says, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution"—the Constitution defined the powers of the United States Government—"nor prohibited by it to the States," in other words, aren't specifically set out for the States, "are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

So what they were basically saying is there are powers out there that this Constitution doesn't cover.

Now, I think we all know that the Constitution has been an evolving process because the big job of the Supreme Court of the United States is to tell us what things mean when you start applying events to the Constitution. There is a clause in the United States Constitution which is called the Commerce Clause. And it says the U.S. Congress shall have the power "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

"Commerce" is the big word, and the question is, what is commerce? And I think if you went to a business school and talked about commerce, you would find out that they are basically talking about the buying and selling and trading and working with goods and services. It would be pretty much what you're talking about. The economic activity, buying and selling and so forth.

Now, a more liberal court started expanding the Commerce Clause slightly,

and the one that really kind of threw everybody off was a case where some folks during the Depression were growing wheat in their own backyard. They were grinding that wheat and making it into bread and they were eating the bread. And the question was, is that wheat in commerce? And the court said because it was competing with other wheat that was being ground into flour and made into bread, it was being sold, and therefore it at some point had an effect upon the commerce involving bread and wheat.

Even though it was only consumed by the family, they expanded it to say that was commerce. And from that the idea came up, and it was cropped up and was challenged and failed several times in the Supreme Court to be carried that far, was that the Commerce Clause, if you take it that far, it will cover everything. And really this bill that we're talking about, this one right here that we just got the report on, this bill is going to be the ultimate decision of whether the Commerce Clause means "commerce" covers everything or not because in this bill, the only thing you have to do to be required to buy health insurance by the government is be alive.

If you are a human being and breathing, you have to buy health insurance. If you have it and you get to keep it, then you've got health insurance, but if you don't have it, now it's no option. You have to buy it.

Now, the first thing you will hear people say is, yes, but you've got to have insurance to drive an automobile and you have to have it. That's true, but that is insurance that is protecting other people from your negligence or your mistakes as you drive your automobile, and it's an issue for the State in protecting the State because it makes sure that people are able to protect those that they might injure when they use a dangerous weapon. And, by the way, it's kind of interesting that the courts have ruled that an automobile can be used to enhance punishment in a criminal case because it is a deadly weapon. So basically they are insuring against the misuse of the deadly weapon called the automobile.

That's not what we're talking about here. We're talking about you have got to have health insurance whether you're sick or whether you're well. You have got to have it. And if you don't, you have got to pay a fine, and that fine is going to be in the nature of an excess tax.

So there's a good place for me to yield to Mr. BURTON to talk about how he sees this and what thoughts come to his mind as we look at this really challenging constitutional issue.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. And I want to tell her how much I appreciate her coming down and taking the time to give this Special Order. It took a lot of preparation to explain this to our colleagues and anybody that might be paying attention to this.

There is no question in my mind that the 10th Amendment of the Constitution is being violated by the bill that we passed, and that's why we have 22 States that have joined in this suit. And I'm glad that they are doing that.

As a matter of fact, on March 29, the Attorney General of Indiana, Greg Zoeller, expressed his intent of having Indiana join in filing the suit against the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which is the Obama care we're talking about. And here is what he had to say, our Attorney General:

He said, "There are significant constitutional questions regarding the Federal Government's authority raised by the legislation passed. I believe it's necessary that these ultimately be brought before the United States Supreme Court, and as the Attorney General of Indiana, I will join in the most appropriate legal actions available to represent the significant interests of our State, the State of Indiana, in this matter." And he prepared a 55-page report on this that he gave to our legislators in Indiana regarding the Patient Protection and Affordability Act. And he believes, as the other attorneys general do, that this is unconstitutional.

Now, my colleague just talked about the automobile business and how people have to have car insurance. Well, they don't have to drive a car. And if they don't drive a car, they don't have to have car insurance.

This is the first time that I can remember in my life that the Federal Government is telling people they have to buy something. I have never heard of this and I have never read anything that would lead me to believe that the Federal Government has the authority to tell people that they have to buy something.

Now, there have been times in the past when the Federal Government tried to take over the entire commerce of the United States. Back in the 1930s during the Roosevelt administration, they passed a law called the National Recovery Act, and the National Recovery Act gave the Federal Government control over the entire economy of the United States regarding commerce. And there was one case that came to mind that I read in a book called "The Forgotten Man." I don't know if my colleagues read it or not. But it involved two itinerant people from the Middle East that came to the United States and they started selling chickens.

Back in those days, they didn't have frozen chickens in the supermarket. So when people would come to them to buy chickens, they had them in crates, and they would let the people that came to buy the chickens reach in and pick the chickens they wanted. Well, the National Recovery Act, which was controlling the commerce of the United States, had individuals, like the IRS is going to have under this bill, that would come out and tell the people what they could and couldn't do. And the National Recovery Act representative came out and told these

two gentlemen that they could not let the people pick the chickens that they wanted.

I know this sounds crazy. They said because the people that came in and bought the chickens first would pick the fatter ones and they would get the benefit of being there first. And the fellows that owned this company said, Well, this is the way we've always done it. We let the people pick the chickens they want. So they didn't change. They continued to conduct their business that way, and they were indicted under the National Recovery Act and they were convicted, and the case went all the way to the United States Supreme Court.

□ 2015

Justice Brandeis wrote the opinion, which was 9-0, against the National Recovery Act, which went out the window. Justice Brandeis sent a message back to the President saying, Don't send us any more legislation like this, because if you do, we'll find it unconstitutional as well.

That was the first time that I know where the Federal Government starting taking over the entire area of the commerce of the United States. Even then, even then, I don't believe there was a time when they said somebody had to buy something, which would violate the 10th Amendment of the Constitution. Now the National Recovery Act was found unconstitutional, but the 10th Amendment, as far as I can remember, never said you have to buy something. And that is what this bill does and that is why the attorneys general from 22 States are saying, You don't have that power.

As you said, Mr. CARTER, very clearly, the power is not delegated to the United States by the Constitution. The power is not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively. And so what's happening here is the Federal Government is overstepping its bounds and violating the 10th Amendment and taking away from the States their right to regulate this industry or to deal with whether or not people should or should not have to buy these things. And the attorneys general are saying very clearly this is a State's right and we don't think the Federal Government has the right to do this under the commerce clause.

So I would just like to add a couple of other things that go along with this, Mr. CARTER, and that is the cost that it's going to be to the American people. The estimated deficit that is going to be created by this, as far as the health care bill is concerned, is about \$385 billion or \$395 billion over the next 10 years.

But the fact of the matter is, it's going to cost a lot more than that. The estimated costs, according to CBO, based upon the information that was sent to them, was that it was going to cost about \$850 billion or \$860 billion

over 10 years, and the amount that was going to be as far as the deficit was concerned was about \$300-some billion.

But the fact of the matter is they only have 6 years of coverages, but they have 10 years of taxes. So when you take 10 years of coverage and 10 years of taxes and you look at what it's going to cost the American people, it's going to run up over \$2 trillion—money we don't have. And the deficit already is out of control. The budget we passed this year was \$3.85 trillion—or last year. And this year they won't even send us a budget because they know it's going to be more than that.

The shortfall in spending that increased the debt, our debt to our kids and grandkids, was \$1.4 trillion last year. It's going to be \$1.6 trillion or more this year, and it's going to get worse as the years go by over the next decade or two. And so in addition to violating the Constitution, as I believe this does, and in addition to having 22 States file suit against the Government of the United States because of this bill, this is going to cost an arm and a leg that we don't have. We don't have this money. And who's going to pay for it?

Well, we borrowed money from China. We owe them about \$800 billion. We borrowed \$600 billion from Japan. If you add it all up, we are probably into the trillions and trillions of dollars that we owe the rest of the world. If they ever cash in on what we owe them, I don't know how we are going to pay for it.

The fact of the matter is, right now, because of the cost of this legislation and the other programs and the deficits that are taking place right now, I really believe that the Federal Government is going to have to print a lot of money. And when they print money, they inflate the money supply and we have what is called inflation. What they try to do is try to figure out a way to stop that inflation by raising interest rates or increasing taxes.

Now the administration is talking about a value-added tax like they have in Europe. And the value-added tax in Europe is running about 20 percent in many countries. And if you buy a car for \$10,000, for instance, and you add the value-added tax to it, you're up to \$12,000. Another 20 percent. The American people can't afford it. We can't afford the inflation, we can't afford the taxes, and what it will do to the economy and jobs is unbelievable, not to mention that it violates the Constitution of the United States.

So if I were talking to the American people tonight, Mr. CARTER—and we can't talk to the American people; we can only talk to each other and the Members of the Congress—I would say there's a lot more to this than just the violation of the Constitution. There's no question in my mind that there is that violation, but the cost to us and our kids and our posterity is going to be unbelievable. This country can't afford to spend the money the way we

are doing it. We can't afford to raise taxes like they are talking about. We can't afford a value-added tax and we can't afford to see jobs slip away from America and go offshore to other countries. That is what I think this is leading to.

This administration believes in a European-style socialistic approach to government, and we have to stop that. I want to pat the attorneys general on the back from those 22 States for leading the charge in dealing with this constitutional abuse of power, and I wish them the very best and I hope that every State in the Union, Mr. CARTER, I hope every State in the Union will join in this fight because the Federal Government should not usurp the rights of the people of this country and the several States. And our Forefathers never planned for that. And that is why they gave the States the ultimate power instead of leaving it with the Federal Government. They said that those powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution are reserved for the States. And that is the way it ought to be.

I want to thank you once again for taking this Special Order. You're one of my heroes.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend, regaining my time. Let me point out something that I think is interesting. In all of the flak we sometimes raise, we disagree with some of the rulings of the United States Supreme Court rulings—and I and others that I know have done that throughout my entire lifetime and had great constitutional issues that are banged around everywhere, and some of us said, What kind of craziness is that? But it's kind of interesting that Justice Brandeis, in that opinion, 9-0—that means everybody thought it was right—pointed out that by the very nature of our Constitution and the very nature of what we created in the way of a Republic, this concept of a centralist-controlled economy, a central-controlled economy, doesn't fit what was founded in this country.

We started down that path in the 1930s. And Brandeis and the Court slammed on the brakes and put a stop to it. It was very ridiculous, some of the things they did. There's the famous kosher meat case that went on and a bunch of other cases. Just ridiculous. Can you imagine the Federal Government going into your local butcher shop and telling your local butcher how he can do things? Is that the world we want? That is a centrist-controlled economy.

Now, at the same time, the world was experiencing this in other places. In fact, we in our lifetime have seen the rise and collapse of central-planned economies. The National Socialist Party of Germany in the Second World War, besides losing a war, proved that a centrally controlled economy was an ineffective way of doing the economy without letting the markets work. The Soviet Union collapsed, continuing to try to keep a central-controlled economy run by the one Big Government

entities that had fingers in everybody's world. It didn't work. It didn't work. The Chinese had the same thing. Even though they still claim communism, they are rapidly rushing towards capitalism because they are getting rich and prosperous for all levels in their country under the capitalist system, which they never could do with their centrally controlled economy.

Why we would even think to go in that direction is beyond me. I think my colleagues think that is the solution to our problems. I do not think so. I think our Founding Fathers intended for us to have things both at the local, at the city, the State, the national level. I think they had a concept of the small family all the way up to the big government. They specifically wrote these little-used provisions, by the way, into the Constitution, to make it clear that there were certain things that didn't belong in the Federal Government.

I'm very hopeful that that is the way that this Court at this time, in the 21st century, with all the history that has passed and all the court cases have passed, will look at this and say, If we can tell them they've got to buy what kind of health insurance, then what's next? How far will we expand this? Can the next administration, whoever it may be, say you have to buy General Motors cars because we own around 50 percent of the stock, the American people, or can it just say, you know, we've got a fledgling industry over here. You can only buy that computer or that pair of socks. But you can't buy those socks. Not until you've got five pairs of those socks. And you want the Federal Government doing that?

I don't think anybody in their right mind in this country wants that to happen. But the start, the crack in the dam, the slow drip is going to be what they have proposed, which is going to be a slow drip that is going to create massive costs to this country. By the way, my friend, Mr. BURTON, wasn't even talking about the cost to the States. Those are Federal costs. They imposed upon the States costs the States didn't have any say in whatsoever.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Would the gentleman yield on that point real quickly? Our Governor, who I think is one of the best Governors in the country, Mitch Daniels, he said that passing this would put 500,000 people more on Medicaid in the State of Indiana. I just wanted to validate the point that you just made. This is going to be a tremendous burden on States all across this country because they are going to shift an awful lot of the burden that is on the Federal health care system to the States. In Indiana, we are going to be spending billions of dollars more over the long haul because they are going to put 500,000 people more on Medicaid. I don't know that that is the exception. I think every State in the Union is going to suffer like that. Those are costs we are not even talking about.

Mr. CARTER. It is. Reclaiming my time, we are joined by my good friend and colleague, classmate, a fellow Texan, Dr. BURGESS, who has spent most of his life on these issues, and certainly his time in Congress. Since the day I met him, he has had the best ideas I have heard on health care, but he's been a voice crying in the wilderness. He does know what we're talking about. I'll be glad to yield to Dr. BURGESS to educate us on what he sees these issues are and where this thing is going.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I must say, it's humbling for a simple country doctor as I to come down here and talk constitutional issues with the great constitutional scholars of our time.

Mr. CARTER. Right.

Mr. BURGESS. Judge, you mentioned something that is so important. So many people are concerned about what they see happening. And I see by one of the posters that you have there that almost 45 percent of the United States population, or State attorneys general representing almost 45 percent of the population, now are suing over the constitutionality of these health care mandates. Remember, all of that has happened within a 4-week time span of us passing this very flawed piece of legislation. There's no way to know what the next 4 weeks will bring; but certainly as more and more people evaluate this, as more and more people dissect through that very flawed product that was passed by the Senate on Christmas Eve, and then we just, for whatever reason, picked up and agreed to it over here in the House the end of March.

As more and more people look at that and see the drafting errors and see the inconsistencies that are contained within that legislation, I believe that that number will in fact become much higher by the time we get to Memorial Day. It will grow in numbers through the month of June. By the time we get to Independence Day, I've got to believe that that number, there is going to be a startling percentage of the United States population that is now against this bill.

The problem with this bill is it never enjoyed popular support. People want to criticize Republicans for being obstructionists in this process but, honestly, they did not need a single Republican vote. They have a 40-majority vote on the Democratic side. This was all an internal argument on the Democratic side with getting this darned thing passed. As a consequence of not having popular support, they had to coerce, cajole, threaten, and malign Members on their own side in order to get the votes necessary to pass this.

Now, right after it passed, Judge CARTER and I were part of a press conference, and our attorney general, Greg Abbott, was one of the first attorneys general to step forward and say, Under the commerce clause, I don't think you can do this. He wrote a very powerful

letter to our two Senators earlier in the year. And I just wanted to quote a couple of paragraphs from this thoughtful and lengthy letter that Greg Abbott wrote to our Senators.

□ 2030

He writes, "The individual mandate is constitutionally suspect because it does not fall within any of these categories. The mandate provision of H.R. 3590 attempts to regulate a non-activity."

Let me just stop for a second. "Attempts to regulate a nonactivity." Are there any other nonactivities we do during the course of the day that we're willing to give over the regulation of those nonactivities to the Federal Government? I think the judge and the minority made the point. Of course there are not.

Continuing to quote from the letter, "The legislation actually imposes a financial penalty upon Americans who choose not to engage in interstate commerce—because they choose not to enter into a contract for health insurance." Quoting further, "In other words, the proposed mandate would compel nearly every American to engage in commerce by forcing them to purchase insurance, and then use that coerced transaction as a basis for claiming authority under the commerce clause."

Continuing to quote from Greg Abbott's letter, "Congress' own independent, nonpartisan research agency, the Congressional Research Service, expressed doubts about the commerce clause's applicability in a report that was issued last July: 'Despite the breadth of powers that have been exercised under the commerce clause, it is unclear whether the clause would provide a solid constitutional foundation for legislation containing a requirement to have health insurance. It may be argued that the mandate goes beyond the bounds of the commerce clause.'"

And then finally just to conclude from Greg Abbott's letter, "If there are to be any limitations on the Federal Government"—let me just underscore that "any" one more time. "If there are to be any limitations on the Federal Government, then 'commerce' cannot be construed to cover every possible human activity under the sun—including mere human existence. The act of doing absolutely nothing does not constitute an act of 'commerce' that Congress is authorized to regulate."

A very powerful letter by the attorney general, issued last January to our two Senators as the Senate was working through this health care bill.

You know, I've been so concerned about this bill that we passed that I wake up in the middle of the night almost every night wondering what the future holds. And Judge, you're so right. In some ways, you kind of get this mental image of this omniscient central planner—albeit a benign and

kind and eloquent central planner—moving data points around on a big spreadsheet somewhere. That's what the administration of health care has become in this country. Look at the job that we have turned over to the Department of Health and Human Services and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, another small Federal agency called the Office of Personnel Management, and yes, for crying out loud, the IRS involved in regulating health care. These Federal agencies are now tasked with writing the rules and regulations out of this 2,700-page behemoth that, again, passed the Senate on Christmas Eve as a vehicle to allow the Senators to get out of town ahead of a snowstorm.

No one read that darn thing. No one knew that what was in that darn thing. They just passed it so they could get out of town. They always intended to come back and make it better in conference or some other secret coordinated meeting with the White House where they would come up with an amalgamated product, but they didn't do it. They didn't follow through. They just picked up this Senate bill. A lot of people don't understand. The Senate bill actually has a House number. It's H.R. 3590.

Now, why would a bill passed by the Senate dealing with health care have a House number? Well, because it began as a House bill. It began over here at the end of last summer as a bill to regulate housing. CHARLIE RANGEL introduced it from the Committee on Ways and Means. It passed the House. I voted against it, for the record, when it was a housing bill. It went over to the Senate and lay fallow for a period of time until the majority leader of the other body decided that they needed a vehicle for this health care reform. They decided not to affix a Senate number to it. The House had passed a bill. They chose not to pick up our House bill that dealt with health care. They picked up our housing bill and amended it. And one of the first amendments was to take the language out of it.

So now they have an empty bill, a number, and literally nothing else. They stuck in all of these little special deals that they had to strike. And the question wasn't, What is the best possible health care policy that we could come up with? In fact, if that question had been asked, maybe they would have used Governor Daniel's use of consumer-directed health plans in his State and how he's held down cost. But they didn't do that. They said, What will it take to get your vote? And whatever that answer was was the piece that was inserted in that bill. That's why you've got an amalgam of so many disconnected pieces in this 2,700-page monstrosity that is now H.R. 3590.

Once that thing passed to get them out of town on Christmas Eve—and it was literally a Christmas tree that night when they passed it. But once they passed that bill, they all expected

to come back to a conference committee or some other vehicle to amend and improve this bill. But when the Senator from Massachusetts was elected as a Republican, it threw a big kink in their plans. They decided the only way to get—and remember, the goal here was not to fix problems that are besetting the American people in our health care system. The goal was to get a bill to sign. The goal was a signing ceremony in the East Wing of the White House. The goal was for the President to sign a bill during his first term.

It's almost like they didn't care what was in it. They didn't care what the health care policy was. It can be as bad as you can possibly imagine. The drafting errors can be rampant throughout the entire bill. But we got a signing ceremony, by golly, and no other President of the United States has ever had that achievement before. And now the rest of us are left with this travesty that's called a health care bill. Doctors, nurses, and hospitals and, indeed, even insurance companies, and of course regular American patients are going to have to deal with this for the next several generations.

We have to rip this thing out root and branch. One of the ways to do that is for the attorneys general to proceed with their lawsuit and be successful in their lawsuit, which is why I so appreciate the gentleman coming to the floor of the House, making the American people aware of what is going on, why the attorneys general are pursuing this, and maybe, maybe we will get some relief for the American people, and then we can go back and do the things they were asking us to do in the first place—fix the problems, not destroy the system.

I will yield back to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for a great description of one of the reasons, when they say, you don't want to watch people make sausage or legislation is because there's no telling what goes in it. And that description of the House bill being gutted of language and changed to a health care bill, I think that's going to be a real eye-opener to the civics classes around the country as to how that thing functioned. And, you know, that's part of the nervousness that we're seeing in the American people, and they're concerned about what's going on up here. That kind of overwhelming power play is just—it's contrary to the old fair play that's deep down inside what makes Americans great. So I appreciate you describing it.

I see Mr. BURTON's risen again. I will yield to him.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding.

I just want to follow up on what my other colleague from Texas just said. He was quoting the attorney general of Texas, Mr. Greg Abbott, and there was one clause in his letter that I thought bears repeating. He said, "If there are

to be any limitations on the Federal Government, then 'commerce' cannot be construed to cover every possible human activity under the sun—including mere human existence. The act of doing absolutely nothing does not constitute an act of 'commerce' that Congress is authorized to regulate."

And this parallels what we were talking about earlier with the National Recovery Act, because it was designed to cover everything back in the 1930s. We talked about a couple of examples. And this attorney general is quoting pretty much what Justice Brandeis was talking about when he wrote the opinion, the 9-0 opinion that destroyed the National Recovery Act, saying that the Federal Government didn't have the right to run everything. And I think that's exactly what your attorney general is talking about.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CARTER. As he was reading from Attorney General Abbott's very well-written letter and he mentioned that particular thought, my thought was, You can let your imagination run wild if we are opening the commerce clause to existing. If existing puts you in commerce, then I think the sky is the limit. And more so, the sky is the horror, because ultimately it can be such an abusive power. And I am not pointing a finger at any administration, but there could be an administration down the road that imposes where you can live. Or one that is really interesting, because there are actually countries in this world that do this, and as we were talking about it, it popped into my head—in some European countries, Western European countries.

You know, there's a misconception—I think my colleagues know this, but if not, I want to at least put my two cents worth in—a misconception that everybody has the same freedoms we've got. Wrong. Just because they've got TV shows that we like or something like that doesn't mean they've got the same kind of free society we have.

The British system has the right of habeas corpus, but there are plenty of countries that don't have the right of habeas corpus. There are plenty of other rights. It's kind of interesting. In European countries, after the war, they wanted people to vote, so they made it mandatory. The government made it mandatory to vote. And if you don't vote—it's just like our health care bill—you get fined.

Now, they don't have a constitution like the United States that limits the power of their government. I'm not saying it's all bad. But to me, if I was a guy who didn't want to vote, they say, Okay. Pay \$50 or you've got to vote. And then what's the next step, Pay \$50 or you have to vote for my party or for my leader. And where does it stop?

Things that are done in good conscience when you open up the power of the Federal Government like this interpretation of the commerce clause, you can use your imagination and your

knowledge of history to see how it could become, at some future time, more and more and more depriving of the liberties that we enjoy. So this is about a whole lot of stuff, and it's a whole lot of stuff that upsets you.

On the issue of Medicare, I think Texas is \$8 billion—isn't that right?

Mr. BURGESS. If the gentleman will yield, several of the State senators have written to me, and, in fact, I believe I'm quoting Governor Perry correctly in that it would be a \$23 billion cost over the 10 years. We do our budget for a 2-year time period, so for the next five budgets.

Now, as the gentleman knows, Texas has not been hit quite as hard as some other States by the recession, but it's still been hit. In the next election, the people who are elected for the next State legislature, for the next State senate are going to have to deal with a budgetary environment that is going to be a great deal tighter than any since probably 2002 or 2003. As a consequence, Governor Perry has tasked all of the various interim Senate committees and House committees to look for 5 percent of savings across the board in the State budget. So they are serious about getting their budget into balance. Of course, by law, they have to do this, and they are looking for every State agency to cut its budget by 5 percent. That's significant when, at the same time, the Federal Government is now saying, because of the increase in Medicare enrollment that you're going to be required to take, the budgetary expansion brought about by this health care bill will be \$23 billion over the next 10 years at a time when every other State agency is being constricted.

So are we saying that federally mandated health insurance is more important than education of Texas children? Apparently we are. Are we saying that the federally mandated health care entitlement is now more important than State transportation issues or State security issues? Apparently we are.

But I know this is a serious problem that is being faced by the State legislators and the State senators, and I have heard from several of them over these past several weeks and the weeks leading up to the passage of this bill. And I know, of course, the Governor has been quite outspoken about the fact that they are going to have to cut their budget at the State level, and I believe every State agency has been asked to come up with 5 percent, a nickel in savings out of every dollar that is spent at the State level.

And it's actually not a bad idea for us. If we were to actually do a budget this year—which I'm not sure we are. For whatever reason, the Democratic leadership does not seem to think that's important, even though this country is in financial crisis, to squeeze 5 cents of savings out of every dollar. It's certainly something most Americans understand in running their own business. During times when I ran

my medical practice, I would be faced with budgetary shortfalls, and I understood the concept of saving a penny or two or three or four or five out of every dollar you spent. And the Governor has wisely asked his State agencies to do that. We don't seem to be quite so knowledgeable here at the Federal level sometimes.

I will yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding back.

Let me say this. I think it's very interesting because Governor Perry's saying that we've got to cut 5 percent. I say hooray for that. I think that's the right way to go about it. But this bill tells us, we've got to set up—somebody in our State has to help administer this bill. And ultimately, we've got to come up with these pools, regional pools. We are pressuring our States to make this thing work, and our States say, We don't want that thing. And we certainly don't want the expense of doing it at the expense of our taxpayers' dollars because we're trying to tighten our budget.

You're right, we are lucky in Texas, fortunate that the economy hasn't hit us as hard. In fact, in my district in recent times, probably the hardest hit we received from this Chamber right here and the one across the way, when the President signed the nationalization of student loans and wiped out 500 jobs in Killeen, Texas. In Killeen, Texas, 500 jobs is a lot of jobs, and 500 jobs in central Texas is a lot of jobs, and that's just the tip of the iceberg of what ill-conceived ideas can do.

This one here is a constitutional challenge to our Federal Government and our Supreme Court. I have great confidence that they will accept that challenge, and I am hopeful that they will say, You can't expand the commerce clause to breathing. It just can't go that far. You don't need commerce because you exist.

□ 2045

If it is, then I would argue that there are no controls on the Federal Government's ability to do things to impose burdens upon your life. I think that is the real underlying issue here, and it is of great importance.

But even more so than that is when we came up with the concept of Medicaid, and Congressman BURGESS, he worked under Medicaid as a doctor. He knows what it is. But Medicaid is a contract between the individual States and the Federal Government to come up with a solution for poor people's health care. It was designed for the poor, the underprivileged. And it was designed that the States and the Federal Government, the Federal Government would have the ability to work with the States to put together a contract and the State would provide so much resources and administer the program, and the Federal Government would provide so much resources.

This bill, without any input whatsoever not only from the Republicans, no

input from the Republicans in the House of Representatives, but no input from the States. They got their contract renegotiated by the Federal Government without their say. Now they have this huge financial and bureaucratic burden that is being placed upon the States by the fact that part of the way they were able to get the solution, all of the people not covered by health care, was to take a big chunk of people and just stick them in Medicaid, and say oh, by the way, States, we decided this is what you're going to do, and you're going to do it. We'll pay our share, maybe, but you've got to pay yours. And you've got to administer the program.

I think that some of the States, and I know in the Florida case, they are raising that issue. They are saying: Can you impose this upon the States at this level? I don't know.

The main issue is the commerce clause. That is the imposition of burdens not anticipated when the deal was struck. I think that is an important part of everything that we are talking about here.

You know, there are people who say oh, that CARTER and that bunch, they are a bunch of right wing nuts down there on the floor. They are all upset about this and they call them Socialists. Well, yeah, but did you look at this map? Have you looked at this map? I wouldn't call several areas of this country that is marked in red as bastions of conservatism by any stretch of the imagination, not that they don't have the right to be the State that they are. I am not criticizing them for their beliefs, but this is not some right wing conspiracy out of central Texas, okay; this is a cross-section of the country. The West Coast, represented by Washington State, certainly a progressive State, proud to be a progressive State; we have Pennsylvania over here on the east, and Michigan in the Midwest. This area up here is the heart and soul of the declining auto industry with all of their terrible problems. Everybody at night ought to say a prayer for the people in Michigan right now because they are having the hardest time of anyone in this Union right now. And we need to correct that as best we can.

More than that, I would at least submit that The Washington Post is certainly not something that Rush Limbaugh and the boys read and consider their newspaper, but let's see what The Washington Post said on March 21: The individual mandates extends the commerce clause's power beyond economic activity to economic inactivity. That is unprecedented. Congress has used its taxing power to fund Social Security and Medicare. Never before has it used its commerce power to mandate an individual person engaged in an economic transaction with a private company. Regulating the automobile industry by paying cash for clunkers is one thing, making everybody buy a Chevy is quite another.

That was in The Washington Post. I would argue and I think they would argue with me it is a liberal newspaper. But this is not a liberal or conservative fight. This is about freedom and liberty and our Constitution.

I yield to Congressman BURGESS.

Mr. BURGESS. I was going to agree with the gentleman that The Washington Post is not likely to be found in the Rush Limbaugh stack of stuff that he uses on his radio program everyday.

But the freedom argument is one that is so important. Under the Medicaid provisions, as I understand and read the bill that was passed by this House, individuals who earn at or below 133 percent of the Federal poverty level, if they are not covered by any other insurance, since they are going to be required to have insurance, will, in fact, be required to have Medicaid. They will not be allowed to purchase insurance in the exchange, as other Americans will. They will simply be placed into the Medicaid program.

That, too, is unprecedented. In any of the social entitlements that we have had in the past, never had we required someone by virtue of their income level to be within a certain Federal aid program.

The implications of that are startling and may well go far beyond the boundaries of where they exist today with the passage of this law. It may be a much more startling recession or receding of freedom than we have seen in this country. Really, it would be unprecedented the loss of freedom that will accompany this bill.

I will yield back to the gentleman because I know time is short, but that is an extremely important point that the gentleman just made.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, 23 million Americans will still have no health coverage in 2019 after this bill is fully implemented. So with all of the big imposition on the privacy of American citizens, and the big imposition on our government of mandating them that they have to buy a product, and if they do everything that they are supposed to do and if the States can find the money to run the Medicaid problem, and if they can get the various agencies up and functioning and somewhere find the money to pay the salaries to run them, and if we create this bureaucracy, we will still have 23 million Americans that won't have health care coverage. Hmm.

If your goal was to cover everybody, you failed. I don't think it is really the goal to cover everybody. I think the goal is to put control of another part of the American economy and Americans' lives in the hands of the Federal Government. That's what I think this is about. And that is what I think it has always been about since we started this discussion.

That is why the American people were telling us what we want to talk about is cost. This stuff costs too much. What can you do to get the cost down? There is no cost savings in any of this; there is only cost imposition.

So the one thing that I think we have a great shortage of in this town with present company excepted is common sense. But I have great confidence in the average American, whether he be the Wall Street fat cat or the guy working in the grocery store in Round Rock, Texas, they have common sense to know what is good form and what is not good form. I think that is why we are seeing people getting up off the couch and making their voices heard because this doesn't make common sense. This is not the kind of world we signed on to. It is not the kind of world we fought wars for.

We have an issue that it seems to grow in intensity as the weeks go by. It is almost the gift that keeps on giving in that there is just more to talk about every week. I, too, like Congressman BURGESS, lie awake in the middle of the night and can't get back to sleep thinking about what is coming down the road and what we have to do.

Many of my colleagues don't believe this, but I understand we are about to have a report come out on this, just as an aside, all of the Members of Congress and all of their office staffs were, on page 157 of this bill, taken out of their health care program and put under the pools. It is a very interesting challenge.

HONORING TWO TRAILBLAZERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHU). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Speaker, now that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have completed their hour of speaking of how that long-needed, hard-fought for health insurance and preventive services for those who have had little or no access to health care ought to be taken away, praising the AGs, as they were, who are challenging the law through which we Democrats provided the opportunity to every American for health and wellness, we are now going to turn to remembering two individuals who all of their lives worked to ensure that access to health, education, and economic opportunity was available for all.

Some of my colleagues spoke of the life and legacy of Dr. Dorothy Irene Height last week when Congresswoman FUDGE's resolution was on the floor, but the Congressional Black Caucus wanted to use this time this evening to continue that tribute and also pay tribute to Dr. Benjamin Hooks. I consider it a great honor and pleasure to anchor this hour of tribute to two of our Nation's trailblazers, two drum majors for justice, to incomparable human beings whom we mourn because they are no longer physically with us, but who will forever be with us in spirit and through the rich legacy that they both have left.

Individually, as communities of color and as a Nation, we are far better because they passed this way and touched our lives during their earthly journeys. The people I am speaking of are Dr. Benjamin Hooks and Dr. Dorothy I. Height.

On Dr. Hooks, although I had the honor of meeting him, I didn't get to know Dr. Benjamin Hooks personally. But everyone knows or ought to know of the little old country creature that he referred to himself as, but which surely grossly understated the measure of this luminary of civil rights and champion for a better America.

A native Tennessean, civil rights leader, Baptist minister, attorney and judge, in fact, the first black judge to serve in that position in Tennessee and in all of the South after reconstruction, he, like Dr. Height, has made an immeasurable contribution to this country that will continue to reverberate for generations to come.

His life experiences in high school, and particularly in World War II, and his conquering of them all, I think is what served to fuel his passion and his determination to ensure equality and justice for everyone in this country regardless of race, color, religion, creed or nationality.

In a different and less strident partisan time, he was appointed to the FCC, the first African American commissioner, by President Richard Nixon, as was my father to the Federal district court in the Virgin Islands.

That Congressmen RUSH, BUTTERFIELD, and I must continue to raise the same issues today that he championed: the need for more minority ownership of radio and TV stations, for more diversity in employees in the industry, as well as for more positive image of African Americans in the media, is not at all reflective of the cogency of his argument or the determination of his effort, but more of the depth and intransigence of the institutional racism that continues to exist in this country.

An unrelenting supporter and advocate for self-help, he revived the NAACP during his legendary tenure of 20 years, while furthering and strengthening its missions, goals and ideals. He, like Dr. Dorothy Height, is the recipient of both the President's Medal of Freedom and the Congressional Gold Medal.

It is not enough that the University of Memphis works to carry on his league see through the Benjamin Hooks Institute for Social Change, it is up to those of us on whose behalf he served to live his life and these words of his: "If anyone thinks we are going to stop agitating, they better think again. If anyone thinks we are going to stop litigating, they had better close up the courts. If anyone thinks we are not going to demonstrate and protest, they had better roll up the sidewalks."

The Congressional Black Caucus, through our positions, our advocacy, and our legislative efforts here in Congress, live those words every day and

are proud to join the NAACP in taking up the torch he has passed to us with pride.

□ 2100

Let me say a few words about Dr. Height. This country is indebted to her for so many rights and privileges that we enjoy today, from her work opening doors at YMCAs, to her empowering of communities in Mississippi and elsewhere, to her leadership in the struggles for women's rights and civil rights, her uplifting of the African American families through the Annual Family Reunions, her enrichment and advancement of the National Council of Negro Women, and all of the many ways she helped shape policy and found ways to address old and new ills in our community. There is not anyone who has not benefited from her life of service.

I want to spend my time, though, talking about the times and ways in which I was privileged to play what was but an infinitesimal part in her work. First, it was always an honor to be in her presence. But in addition to the invitations, the receptions, meetings, social activities, she also pulled me into her work with young women and health. I was able to be part of her efforts on HIV and AIDS. I had the opportunity to address her town halls, most recently a little over a year ago, a town hall on preventing obesity and lead poisoning in children in black and other poor communities.

And I got to be a part of her planning and developing the 12 or so sites for her anti-obesity programs across the United States. She always made sure that my district, and she did in this case, the U.S. Virgin Islands, was a part of it.

But it wasn't always just the big national issues. She understood the demands of leadership, especially on black women. And so she brought us together to counsel, support, and encourage us from time to time.

It's hard to put in words the deep pride and yet the humble gratitude that I had the opportunity in some small way to get to know Dr. Height, to be one of her countless mentees, to be even a small part of her efforts that I was in recent years. To have had her smile on me was a great blessing that will stay with me and continue to encourage me and guide me as long as I live.

In a few minutes I am going to yield to some of my colleagues and our chairwoman, BARBARA LEE. I want to just read a couple of quotes here, first on Dr. Hooks. This is a quote from President Bush, who bestowed on him the Presidential Medal of Freedom: "For 15 years, Dr. Hooks was a calm, yet forceful voice for fairness, opportunity, and personal responsibility. He never tired or faltered in demanding that our Nation live up to its founding ideals of liberty and equality."

Julian Bond, the chairman emeritus of the NAACP, praised Dr. Hooks at the

time as well, saying: "Benjamin Hooks had a stellar career—civil rights advocate and leader, minister, businessman, public servant—there are few who are his equal," Bond said.

And another quote on Dr. Benjamin Hooks from the president and CEO of the Joint Center on Economic and Political Studies, Dr. Ralph B. Everett. And he said: "Throughout his life and career, the Reverend Dr. Hooks never flinched in the face of enormous challenges, and his expansive dreams were always grounded in the concerns and aspirations of the least fortunate. As we carry on the work of building a better and more inclusive society that affords opportunity to all, we all have Dr. Benjamin Hooks' shining example to keep us on the right path."

Dr. Marian Wright Edelman wrote of Dr. Height on her passing. She started with a quote from Dr. Dorothy Height which reads: "We African American women seldom do just what we want to do, but always what we have to do. I am grateful to have been in a time and place where I could be a part of what was needed." And we are really grateful that she was in a time and a place where she was needed. Dr. Edelman says, and I quote again: "When she passed away on April 20 at age 98, we all lost a treasure, a wise counselor, and a rock we could always lean against for support in tough times."

At this time I am joined by the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE. And I would like to yield her such time as she might consume as she joins me in these tributes.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much. Let me thank the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands for that very moving tribute and for anchoring the Congressional Black Caucus's Special Order tonight.

Madam Speaker, this month our Nation and the world lost two towering giants in the pursuit of freedom and justice for all, Dr. Dorothy Irene Height and Dr. Benjamin Hooks. Both lived long and fruitful lives and leave legacies that will endure for generations to come. Tonight we pay tribute to Dr. Hooks and Dr. Height, two trailblazers, two giants who paved the way and opened the doors of opportunity for countless numbers of Americans.

This week Dr. Height will be laid to rest, and she will be forever remembered as a bold and brilliant African American woman who blazed many trails and opened many doors so that we all could lead freer and more prosperous lives. A matriarch of the civil rights movement and a staunch advocate of women's rights, Dr. Height wore many hats throughout her life, both literally and figuratively, with elegance and with dignity, with excellence and with determination. I am going to miss her so much. She showed us that the fight for women's rights and our struggle for civil and human rights were not mutually exclusive. She was a coalition builder in our work for justice for all.

A couple of months ago, as I was listening to Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN's remarks about her personal involvement with Dr. Height and how she grew to love her, I myself had many, many experiences that brought me very close to Dr. Height. And I can remember one of the last times that we were together. She called and she insisted that I participate, and this was a couple of months ago, in the National Council of Negro Women's annual conference in Maryland. And of course, as Dr. CHRISTENSEN knows, when Dr. Height calls, you answer because you know it's important. There is no way you say no.

But Dr. Height, she knows the schedule here on the Hill because she was constantly here helping us with our outside strategy to move the Congressional Black Caucus's agenda forward. Well, she called and she said she knew how busy I was, she said, but just come out to Maryland for the breakfast. I said, Okay, Dr. Height, I will be there. Well, I got there early, it may have been like 7 o'clock, 7:15, dragging. But there she was in her beautiful hat, sitting at the head table to greet me.

And being with Dr. Height, I tell you, that day I realized that I was in the presence of greatness. And I know, as with all of us, especially the women of the Congressional Black Caucus, whenever she introduced us it was amazing, because she knew so much about each of us and she humbled us by the things that she would say about us. And we would wonder how could this great woman say these nice things about us. I mean, you know, we look up to her as a legendary shero, but yet she always, always lifted us up and made us feel like we may be part of her.

From her legendary stewardship as the national president of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc., to her unprecedented 41-year tenure at the helm of the National Council of Negro Women, Dr. Height, she was a woman of courage and strength. Her commitment to equality was reflected in so many of her pursuits—in fact, in all of her pursuits.

In the 1930s, for example, Dr. Height traveled across the United States to encourage the YWCA chapters to implement interracial chapters. After dedicating more than 60 years of her life to the YWCA, Dr. Height remained proudest of her efforts to direct the Y's attention to the issues of civil rights and racial justice. She was so committed to this work. In fact, the Y named Dr. Height the first director of its new Center for Racial Justice in 1965.

□ 2110

Imagine, in the thirties, this African American woman who put up a one-woman resistance movement to the segregation of the Y—and she won. One person made that difference in the thirties.

As a leader of the United Christian Youth Movement of North America,

Dr. Height worked to desegregate the Armed Forces to stop lynching. Yes, she knew lynching very well in her day. Not too many years ago this country has that stain which we still have to remind ourselves of. She worked to stop lynching, to reform the criminal justice system and to establish free access to public accommodations at a time when racial segregation was the standard, mind you—and I know Dr. CHRISTENSEN remembers that. I remember that very well. That was the standard. Resistance to integration was often fierce. Dr. Height remained forever vigilant. She remained true to her convictions. Even when it was not the comfortable thing to do.

A lifelong advocate for peace and equality, Dr. Height was especially committed to empowering women and girls. She stood toe to toe with our great male civil rights leaders. Oftentimes, she was the only woman in the room, the only woman on the platform. She was steadfast in her dedication to ensure that black women's issues and concerns were addressed. She was forever dedicated to helping women achieve full and equal employment, pay, and education.

Dr. Height was an internationalist. Before many of us began our work on the continent of Africa or in the Caribbean, Dr. Height, as the President of the National Council of Negro Women, had chapters, and she did work in the villages in Africa—work that was visionary, work that touched the lives of so many women, children, and families. She knew that she was a citizen of the world and that she had to work both domestically here in our own country and internationally if, in fact, she were going to be a leader in our global movement. She is an internationally renowned woman.

Dr. Height led the NCNW, helping women and families combat hunger. She also established the Women's Center for Education and Career Advancement, in New York City, to prepare women for entry-level jobs. During her tenure as the President of the NCNW, they were able to buy a beautiful building right up the street, near the Capitol. It's a site where slave traders legally operated what was known as the Center Slave Market. To this day, it is the only African American-owned building on this corridor, proving that she was not only a great leader but an astute businesswoman as well. I'll never forget the evening of the fundraiser where she was able to raise the money to retire the debt, to burn the mortgage.

I mean Dr. Height was an unbelievably clear woman in terms of financial stability and economic security for the organizations that she was a part of, and now we have a building on Pennsylvania Avenue—again, the site of the Center Slave Market. We heard her tell the story of how she found this building which was on that site, and we heard the story about that site, which is too long to talk about tonight, but

there is a wonderful story about that. How she ended up purchasing a building on that site was, really, I think, the hand of God. Dr. Height remained a fighter until her last breath.

During my time here in Congress, especially as chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I always knew that I could call on Dr. Height and that she would be there to support our efforts. Of course, last year, she attended President Barack Obama's first signing of a bill into law at the White House, the Lilly Ledbetter Act. She was present for the unveiling of the Shirley Chisholm portrait and for the bust of Sojourner Truth here in the Capitol. She worked diligently on various issues with the Black Women's Roundtable and the Black Leadership Forum, and she often participated in panels here on Capitol Hill.

Just recently, she joined our efforts to support the 2010 census. She was here in the Rayburn building, you know, helping us organize, giving us the message, speaking to young people, and just saying that we have to make sure that everyone is counted because, if everyone is not counted, they will be counted out. She knew what she was talking about.

We listened to Dr. Height. Many times, we attended many of her fundraisers, and I believe they are uncommon heights. Oftentimes, Dr. Height would talk, maybe, for 20 minutes, for 30 minutes, for 40 minutes, for 45 minutes. The older she got, the more she wanted to tell her story. Even with her talking about so much, people did not get antsy and did not want to leave. They wanted to listen to this great woman who knew Mary McLeod Bethune and Eleanor Roosevelt. We were mesmerized every time we were in her presence, and we wanted to listen. We did not want to leave.

Her passion was really an inspiration to all of us here in Congress. It's hard to imagine that, in the thirties, she provided this resistance movement. I will tell you that we love her, that we celebrate her life—and we do. We mourn her death.

Last week, an individual who I was privileged to meet and to know, Dr. Benjamin Hooks, was laid to rest. He was born on January 31, 1925, in Memphis, Tennessee. He was the fifth of seven children. In life, he was a civil rights leader, a minister, an attorney, and forever a champion of minorities and the poor. He was a man of all seasons. While studying prelaw at LeMoyne-Owen College in Memphis, Dr. Hooks became acutely aware of the realities of racial segregation.

In an interview with U.S. News and World Report, he once recounted and said, I wish I could tell you every time I was on the highway and couldn't use a restroom. My bladder is messed up because of that. My stomach is messed up from eating cold sandwiches.

So, after graduating from law school at DePaul University, Dr. Hooks returned to his native Memphis where he

earned a local reputation as one of the few African American lawyers in town. Thoroughly committed to breaking down the practices of racial segregation which existed in the United States, Dr. Hooks fought prejudice at every single turn.

He said, At the time, you were insulted by law clerks, excluded from white bar associations, and when I was in court, I was lucky to be called "Ben." He recalled this in an interview with Jet Magazine. Usually, it was just "boy." Yet he said the judges were always fair. The discrimination of those days has changed, and today, the South is ahead of the North in many respects in civil rights progress, he said—an ordained Baptist minister, and he could preach.

Dr. Hooks joined the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, SCLC, and he became a pioneer in the NAACP's sponsored restaurant sit-ins and other boycotts of consumer items and services. Dr. Hooks was the first African American Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, a board member of the SCLC, and the first African American criminal court judge in Tennessee history. Twice a month, he flew to Detroit to preach at the Greater New Mount Moriah Baptist Church. Dr. Hooks was a true public servant who committed his life to empowering communities of color.

As the executive director of the NAACP from 1977 to 1992, Dr. Hooks increased the NAACP's membership by several hundred thousand people and raised critical funds for the association. He was instrumental in establishing a program in which 200 corporations agreed to participate in economic development projects in black communities.

In 1986, the NAACP recognized Dr. Hooks for his lifetime commitment to civil rights by awarding him the Spingarn award, the NAACP's highest honor. He also rightfully received the Presidential Medal of Freedom. What a man. What a man. He is going to be missed. We miss him already, and I know, though, that the NAACP has taken up Dr. Hooks' mantle and has mounted a very, very active, focused, and committed campaign to the principles and to the work of Dr. Benjamin Hooks.

So, with the passing of Dr. Height and Dr. Hooks, our Nation mourns the loss of true national treasures. Dr. Height's leadership in the struggle for equality and human rights and women's rights serves as an inspiration to all. Dr. Hooks will be remembered as a man who ceaselessly demanded that America live up to its founding principle of justice, equality, and liberty. They will be truly missed.

So, in the memory of Dr. Height and Dr. Hooks, it is the duty, I think, of all Americans to pick up and to carry this baton of freedom and justice. The world is a better place for everyone because Dr. Hooks and Dr. Height lived their lives according to really what

they believed that God put them on this Earth to do. I think we all have a responsibility to keep their legacies alive.

□ 2120

Congressman CHRISTENSEN knows, and every Member of this House knows this is a very intense, busy, hard job. We work here day and night. We go to our districts day and night. And whenever we get weary or think that we can't go any further, I am reminded of Dr. Height and Dr. Hooks, who exemplified the words of a gospel song that many of us sing oftentimes in church on Sunday. These words: I ain't no way tired. I've come too far from where I started from. Nobody told me that the road would be easy, but I know he didn't bring me this far to leave me.

Even when the road was very difficult, and it was very difficult for these two great human beings, they kept going. They didn't get tired. They kept going because they knew their purpose and they knew that one day they would rest in peace. That day has come. But their spirit will live forever in the work of the Congressional Black Caucus and in the work of all of those that they touch. May they rest in peace.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Congresswoman LEE, and thank you for your leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus. And we know that under your leadership we will take up the mantle, take up the torch that they have left for us and carry on their legacy.

I would like to say to Mrs. Frances Hooks, who is always at her husband's side, his right hand and probably his left hand too, you were an integral part of all that your husband accomplished, and we thank you too for your contributions. On behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus and on behalf of the people of the Virgin Islands, we extend condolences to you and the family. We in the Virgin Islands have also benefited by the work of Dr. Hooks.

And to Dr. Height's sister Anthanette Height Aldridge, and her family, to the council, to the Delta Sisterhood, and especially to two outstanding women who I consider to be Dr. Height's daughters, the Honorable Alexis Herman and the Reverend Barbara Williams Skinner, we extend condolences on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus again and on behalf of my Virgin Islands family and the gratitude of all us for allowing and welcoming us into the life of Dr. Dorothy Irene Height.

As many people have said, both Dr. Hooks and Dr. Height leave big and awesome shoes to fill, but their lives continue to speak to us and what they are saying, what I hear them saying, is step right into those shoes, fill them any way you can, and keep marching on until victory is won.

THE AMERICAN ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I appreciate your indulgence this evening and the opportunity to address you here on the floor of the House.

Not having had the opportunity to listen to the dialogue of the previous people, I will take this up where the front of my mind and my conscience happens to be, and that is what is happening with and to America, what are our priorities, where are we going to go from here, presuming that we could actually reverse many of the things that have taken place over the last 1½ years or longer.

Madam Speaker, I would ask your indulgence to just cast your mind back into the last 1½ years or so, this being April 2010. In fact, I would take us back into August and September of 2008, perhaps a little more than 18 months by now. And what we have seen happen is that we saw a concern about the potential economic collapse of the free world, the fear that global currency and the confidence that allows us to trade in that currency could collapse and that we would see the free market economy and the markets within the world, including the Dow Jones and a number of the other market indexes, the Nikkei market, European market, and that list goes on, those lose the confidence of the investors if that happened, if the investors pulled their money out, if, in fact, there was any money to be pulled out, we could have seen a downward spiral that could have been a crash of our economic system that could have potentially eclipsed that of the Stock Market Crash that precipitated the Great Depression in October 1929.

We saw the Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Paulson come to this Capitol on September 19, 2008, and make a request, a very serious request, and some might characterize it as a demand, for 700 billion taxpayer dollars, 700 billion taxpayer dollars to inject into this economy in a fashion that he saw fit, in a fashion that wasn't necessarily laid out for us. We didn't understand particularly his presentation. We heard the words he said but it wasn't definitive. It wasn't clear. And as we found out after the \$700 billion worth of TARP passed, even those words didn't hold so very accurately when we looked at the actual practice of how the \$700 billion was spent.

So, Madam Speaker, that was the start of this long saga of what America's free enterprise economy, what is left of it, might look like and how we might manage these finances.

It's interesting to me that since that time, I have done some traveling around the world and I recall listening to Angela Merkel and the leaders in Germany the following February, if my

memory serves me correctly, so it would be February of 2009, say to us, America, you're spending too much money. You should not dump the \$700 billion in TARP in. It is a waste of money. It is irresponsible. You need to pull back. Their proposal in Germany, even though that is a social democracy, a nation that wants to have as much of it, apparently, within the hands of the government to manage as they can and a minimal amount within the free enterprise system, they have a different belief in it than we have.

They had a \$450 billion plan; ours was a \$700 billion plan followed by a \$787 billion plan, coupled with \$1 or \$2 trillion disbursed by the U.S. Treasury that wasn't within the province or the guidance of this Congress, and I think it's awfully hard to track what that might have meant.

□ 2130

Theirs was \$450 billion. I believe the number was \$80 billion in targeted expenditures and the rest were loan guarantees. So one might argue the German approach to this—the people that originated socialized medicine, by the way—was they would spend \$80 billion in an economic stimulus plan. Now, granted, their economy is not as large as ours, but \$80 billion versus \$700 billion, and another \$787 billion, Madam Speaker, and we have the Germans admonishing us because we're spending too much money in trying to stimulate the economy in this robust Keynesian approach. And then since that time we've heard the President of France lecture us on the dangers of appeasement.

Oh, what a world we have today. How so much it has changed in the last 2 or 3 years, Madam Speaker. How so much the philosophy that has made America great has been pushed to the sidelines, hasn't emerged very much in the thought process, the decisionmaking component of this, at least, even though it remains in the hearts and minds of the American people.

So, Madam Speaker, here we are today, \$700 billion in TARP spending, gone, spent, blown. This, yes, was initiated under the Bush administration, as was the nationalization of several financial institutions and the beginnings of the nationalization of AIG. However, the balance of all these things that I'm about to talk about came about under the Obama administration. And everything that I'm talking about, from the \$700 billion TARP funding all the way through to today, was supported by either then-Senator Barack Obama, candidate for the Presidency Barack Obama, or the President of the United States, Barack Obama. That policy is indistinguishable whether he supported it as a Senator, whether he supported it because he was a candidate for the President or because he supported it as the President-elect or the President of the United States.

And George Bush gave some deference to Barack Obama on how he would approach this economy. One day

I hope to have that conversation with President Bush. But, in any case, there's no component of this voracious appetite for overspending and pushing government into every corner of our private sector lives, there's no aspect of this that wasn't supported by the President of the United States, Barack Obama.

The American people know that and they understand it, Madam Speaker. And so what we have seen, we have seen the support for the \$700 billion in TARP. In fact, this Congress limited the first half of that to \$350 billion. And that went, essentially, without strings attached. And the balance of that, the other \$350 billion, had to be approved. This was in October of 2008, so it had to be approved by a Congress to be elected later and by a President to be elected later. We know what happened. The second \$350 billion was approved by the Congress elected in November of 2008 and approved by the President who was elected in 2008, Barack Obama.

So this entire lexicon of things that happened economically, good or bad, are not the fault of George Bush. They are not laid at the feet of the previous President. These are the responsibilities of this Congress, the House, the Senate, under the leadership of Speaker PELOSI, the leadership of HARRY REID down that aisle, and the leadership of Barack Obama, whom I have sometimes described as a ruling troika, Madam Speaker. That would be, as I warned America about during that same period of time, if you elect Barack Obama as the President of the United States and re-renew the Speakership of NANCY PELOSI—in other words, reelect the Democrat majority here in the House—and you continue to expand the majority of the Democrats in the United States Senate, we will have created, and this is something that I believe is part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a ruling troika in America—that ruling troika being the President, Speaker PELOSI, HARRY REID, who could, by my words then, upheld to be true since then, go into a phone booth, the three of them—haven't done so literally, but figuratively they have—and decided what they would do to America.

Their accountability isn't to the American people. It isn't to the will of the American people. Their accountability is only to the members of their own caucus as to whether they would not just reelect them as leaders but decline to un-elect them as the leaders of their caucus. That is the only restraint that is on them and then the restraint of pushing policies that they couldn't pull the votes to get past.

It came very close here in the House a couple of times. And I have respect for political operators that have an ability to get those tough votes through and get them passed. In fact, if it's the right thing to do, it's a hard thing to run a good country—in fact, a great country—if you can't get those

tough votes accomplished. But I will suggest, Madam Speaker, that many of the things that have happened in this Congress, the 111th Congress and the 110th Congress that preceded it, are anathema to the American vision and anathema to the American Dream, that they run contrary to the principles that made America great.

I can take us down this path. TARP is one of them. The Federal Government's business isn't to come in and decide which businesses are too big to be allowed to fail and then put a huge bill against the taxpayers, their children and their grandchildren; borrow the money from the Chinese and the Saudis; and then make decisions on which businesses should be allowed to succeed, with government help, and which businesses should be allowed to fail.

This country has got to be run by free enterprise, by the free markets; and if businesses fail, they have to be allowed to fail. And investors need to be able to come in and pick up the pieces at the discount that is available when they go through chapter 11 or 7. Their assets are still there. They can be managed by other corporate entities or noncorporate entities, for that matter.

It isn't that if a bank went under or if AIG the insurance company went under that all of a sudden all of the assets that they have are dispersed or sunk into the ocean somewhere. The hard assets are still there. The accounts are still there. They can still be managed by some entity that comes in and picks up the pieces. I have seen this happen a number of times far too close to make me comfortable within the banks that were closed back during those years in the farm crisis years of the eighties.

It happened over and over again, hundreds and hundreds of banks went under. And when they went under, they were recapitalized. New board of directors. New investors came in and picked up those shares of stock. They looked at the loan portfolios, they looked at the deposits, and they made management decisions to put that bank back on a profitable track. Many of those banks, most of those banks, and I don't know that I could say all of those banks actually got turned back into profit. Yes, there were banks that were closed. There were those whose doors were shut and didn't open again. But many banks came under new ownership because they were sold back into the private sector. Even though the FDIC found themselves brokering assets of banks no longer solvent, they did not hold on to the assets of those banks and operate those banks as if they were players in the private sector.

But what we have seen happen with this Obama White House is entirely different than what we saw during the farm crisis years of the eighties. First, this idea of too big to fail. Too big to fail, Madam Speaker. No one in America's britches should be too big to fail.

Too big for their britches, but they can't fail.

I'd point out a presentation that was made to us about 3 years ago at an 8 a.m. Wednesday morning meeting which I host, a breakfast which I host and have done so for 5½ years, the Conservative Opportunities Society. One of the very smart financial presenters there—since that is off the record in that meeting, I can address what he said, but not his name—we were talking about the subprime mortgage crisis. And he said, When you're in the business, the investment banking business, where he'd been for 30 years, what you do in this business is—and he paused for effect and said, Pretty much whatever everybody else does. That way, if they're making money, you're making money. But if things melt down and there is a bailout, then you will be bailed out with everybody else.

Madam Speaker, it's not hard for me to imagine what that does to the investment minds of people that are operating investment banks if they know implicitly, not explicitly, that they can take a lot of risks and they are never really going to go under because the Federal Government will come in and bail them out. That was the implicit guarantee in banks that were too big to be allowed to fail. And it was followed through upon by this government, by this President, in this administration, in this time, and approved by him as a United States Senator and approved by him as a candidate for the Presidency.

Too big too fail became too big to be allowed to fail. Too big to be allowed to fail. The Federal Government would come in, and if we didn't have the money to bail out these businesses, then we would tap into the United States Treasury, who would borrow it and borrow it from the Chinese and the Saudis and anybody else that could invest in U.S. bonds and pick up these businesses.

So the Federal Government nationalized three large investment banks in the aftermath of this September 19 visit to the Capitol by Henry Paulsen, then the Secretary of the Treasury. Three large investment banks, ownership taken over. Ownership or control taken over by the Federal Government. AIG, the insurance company, \$180 billion invested in an insurance company, was guaranteeing securities.

And then we back this up to the late seventies when the Community Reinvestment Act was passed because there were lenders that were not willing to make bad loans in bad neighborhoods. They had drawn red lines and concluded the asset value was diminishing, not appreciating, and the return on that investment, let's say the collateral value was shrinking. Therefore, if they loaned against that collateral value, they would find themselves upside down in those mortgage loans. So they drew lines around the neighborhoods where the value of assets was going down.

Now, some argued that it was a racist decision. I don't know that. I wasn't in those rooms and I don't know those people. For all I know, I never met the people that were making those decisions. If it was for the racist reason, it's kind of like racial profiling. If that is your only reason, then it's wrong. But if it's an indicator that makes you look at the totality of the record, okay, then it may not be wrong. But lenders were drawing a red line around these neighborhoods, and they refused to make those loans into those neighborhoods.

And there was a political decision made in this Congress that they were going to force lenders to make loans into those neighborhoods that had red lines drawn around them. That was the Community Reinvestment Act. But the problem was that they couldn't get the banks to make enough loans into those neighborhoods because the collateral value was going down and the underwriting requirements for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac prohibited them from picking up on the secondary market some of those bad loans.

So in 1978 I believe was the year when the Community Reinvestment Act was passed. They expected that there would be a lot more loans made into these neighborhoods that were redlined. There were more lines made but not enough to satisfy the organizations out there in the inner city. The community organizers—we can ask the President about community organizers. What do they do? They advocate for taxpayer dollars and redistribute those taxpayer dollars into the neighborhoods. They don't contribute to the free enterprise economy. They just tap into the taxpayers, distribute those taxpayer dollars, and in exchange trade off for political power. That is what community organizers do.

So these community organizers concluded that they weren't going to get enough loans into those neighborhoods so they came back to this Congress and lobbied this Congress in the nineties to make changes in the Community Reinvestment Act and, by the way, because of the Community Reinvestment Act, they also found out that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac had strict enough underwriting requirements, that because of those capital requirements and the underwriting requirements, Fannie and Freddie, the secondary loan market, the GSEs in the United States, could not pick up those loans off of those lending institutions.

And so they have refreshed the Community Reinvestment Act and made it a little more strict, but also into the bargain they lowered the underwriting requirements for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Now we have created a scenario for real bad loans in bad neighborhoods, real net loss to the lenders. But the lenders weren't on the hook so much because as soon as they could make a loan into a neighborhood that was approved by organizations like ACORN, they could peddle that

loan off into the secondary market and Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac would pick up the entire tab on that and the original lender would be off the hook.

So there's plenty of incentive for the original lenders to be retail marketing bad loans in bad neighborhoods as long as they could package them up, sell them into the secondary market under Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac then got to this point where they could see that they need to divest themselves of some of those loans, and they sliced them and diced them, and turned around and spun them back into the tertiary market and beyond.

So as this mortgage market was moving along, it was still moving slowly through the nineties. And we got towards the end of the nineties, and actually to the year 2000, when George Bush was elected, we had at the end of the nineties the bursting of the dot-com bubble. When the dot-com bubble was burst—and I suspect it was pierced by the class action lawsuits that were brought against Microsoft by the State attorneys generals, my State Attorney General Tom Miller included—in fact, one of the ringleaders in the lawsuit against Microsoft. I actually think that the dot-com bubble would have burst anyway. Because what it was, it was a speculator's bubble. Yes, there was value in our ability to store and transfer information more effectively than ever before. The speculators invested in that. They bet that would return on their investment and these technology companies would blossom and make huge profits and they would cash in on them.

□ 2140

But this bubble was created out of that speculation, and the thing that wasn't corrected for some time until the bursting or the piercing of the dot-com bubble was the inability for the market to consider that having that technological ability to store and transfer information more effectively than ever before didn't necessarily translate into profits for companies. You have to produce something more efficiently in order for the value of that company to be there.

So, with the Internet, for example, whatever the Internet does to improve the productivity of all of our companies—and anybody that is engaged in business will know that it does improve your productivity as a company—you have the value of that productivity as to what it's worth, not what you speculate you can store or transfer for information.

The only other things that you got to add to that dot-com bubble value was the increase in productivity and the value that you have for recreation. So if people surf the Internet, and they were willing to pay for that, that was a component of our economy.

But the dot-com bubble burst. And as it collapsed, we were seeing the end of the Clinton administration. That was

the recession that they talked about during that period of time. And as George Bush was elected, we saw Alan Greenspan make an evaluation—and I suspect this is accurate, and he would have a different opinion of it perhaps—but that we needed to make some adjustments in this economy in order to compensate for our declining economy because of the bursting of the dot-com bubble. Remember, the bubble burst, and it left a depression within our economy. And I don't use that in economic terms. I use that in, let's say, literal terms.

So Alan Greenspan looked at that and decided that we need to recover this economy. How do we do this? Well, unnaturally low interest rates. We're going to promote more mortgage loans. We are going to create a housing market and a housing boom, and we are going to use that to fill the hole in the dot-com bubble. That's the scenario that was playing out.

So unnaturally low interest rates with an encouragement for people to borrow money on terms that they hadn't seen in their adult lifetimes, you couple that with the Community Reinvestment Act, passed in the seventies, refreshed in the nineties, coupled with the lowering of the capital and the underwriter requirements of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and an aggressive lobbying part on the part of ACORN, who came to this Congress and lobbied to lower the underwriting standards for Fannie and Freddie and to push the Community Reinvestment Act, and ACORN finding themselves and putting themselves in a position in the communities whereby they got to approve or disapprove of the effort of the lending institutions to make bad loans in bad neighborhoods.

Now we have cooked up the perfect economic witch's brew, Madam Speaker, that resulted in the toxic mortgages that nearly brought down the global economy. That's a component of the scenario which nearly brought down the global economy. And as these investment banks, lending institutions picked up the mortgage loans on the secondary market, Fannie and Freddie tranced them, sliced and diced them, packaged them, shuffled them, cut the deck, sorted them out and began to sell them on up the market.

AIG, the insurance company, was looking at these bundles of mortgage-backed securities, setting a premium risk rate on these bundles and charging that premium. And whenever they were packaged and bundled and marketed for a profit, the people that were doing that were taking their profit out and passing the risk on, and AIG was passing judgment on that risk with no check and no balance and no one looking over their shoulder, and no one knew the market. They just trusted that AIG would know the answer because, after all, they were the premiere insurance company. They had been growing by leaps and bounds. But their agents were skimming—I don't know if

I would say “skimming” is a fair enough word. But their agents were taking a profit out for the marketing of the policies and the premiums, but there was no continued responsibility and liability.

So I'll suggest that when people make investments and they pass those investments up the line and they can take profit out of them at every step along the way, it's kind of like the reverse of the value-added tax, isn't it, Madam Speaker, where every time you can bundle up some mortgage-backed securities, package them up, get AIG to set a premium on that and get a guaranteed return rate because AIG's premium is there, pass that on up the line, you take your margin out of that, it's kind of like selling the wheat and paying the tax to the Federal Government and sending the invoice along with it while the guy at the mill grinds the wheat into flour. He takes the invoice from the value-added tax and uses that for his credit, and it goes on up the line. He pays his 10 percent tax and goes to the baker, and the baker then uses the two invoice credits of the 10 percent on the wheat and the value added that is another 10 percent on the increased amount on the flour that's milled from the wheat that goes to the baker who pays the tax of what's left on the value added before it goes to become the bread.

□ 2150

The same was going on during the era of the Community Reinvestment Act and Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and the tranche mortgage-backed securities and AIG guaranteeing, passing that thing all of the way up the line. It became, yes, there was foundational value underneath these mortgages. That is the market value of the real estate, but it also was a huge chain letter that was marketed all of the way up through. And when the investors in the world lost confidence that they no longer knew the value of these bundles of mortgage-backed securities, then that happened, then we were threatened with an economic meltdown, Madam Speaker.

That is kind of how we got here. And now, as the economy spirals downward, or more or less the threat of the economy spiraling downward, we look to a President who is a Keynesian economist on steroids. He believes, and I have certainly heard it directly from his lips in very short range that Franklin Delano Roosevelt lost his nerve on spending and that he just didn't spend enough money. If he would have spent a lot of more money, it is the view of the President, whom I take at his word, that the Great Depression would have been over in the 1930s and we wouldn't have had to wait until World War II that brought about the most effective economic stimulus plan ever. That would also be the President's view.

But I will submit when the stock market crashed in October of 1929 and

we saw my Iowa President do some things that FDR may well have approved of, and FDR went in with the New Deal, which, in my view, was a really bad deal, and in President Obama's view was a pretty good deal and could have been a better deal if he spent a lot more money, it didn't bring about a recovery from the Depression that started in October of 1929, but what it did when the Federal Government borrowed a lot of money, and they borrowed it from the American people in the form of bonds, they created a lot of make-work projects, had to pay the interest, had to pay the principal, we had all of this debt going on at the beginning of World War II. And then we had to take on a lot more debt. But at least during that period of time, had we not borrowed all of that money, not spent all of that money, then the United States economy would not have had to service all of the interest and service all of the debt.

Interest and principal. Could it be that the people in this country have forgotten what interest and principal is and what it takes in cash flow to service the debt. And will they ever figure out what it is like to be on the other side of this?

I recall a very good neighbor and a wise mentor friend of mine, Dennis Lindberg, who has since passed away, told me a story about when he was a young man and how he had the experience of paying interest at a very young age. He said to me, I decided early on that if I was going to have anything to do with interest, I was going to be the one collecting it.

But this government looks like they will have a lot to do with interest, and they will forever be the ones paying the interest rather than collecting the interest.

So this economy has been diminished by the burden that has been put upon it, just like it was diminished in the 1930s by the burden put upon it. The stock market crashed in October of 1929, and it didn't recover during the Great Depression years of the 1930s. It didn't recover during World War II. The stock market was still struggling to get back to where it was at the end of World War II, at the beginning of the Korean War, at the end of the Korean war. It wasn't FDR who solved the problem. FDR delayed the recovery by borrowing all of that money and spending all of that money in the New Deal during the Great Depression. The stock market didn't come back to where it was in 1929 until Franklin Delano Roosevelt had been dead for 9 years; 1954 is when the Dow Jones Industrial Average recovered to the place where it was when it crashed in October of 1929. All of those years, 9 years after Franklin Delano Roosevelt passed away.

And I want to give him a tip of the hat and a nod, and a significant measure of respect for the way he led this country in World War II. He was solid. He was an anchor, he was stalwart, and a commander in chief. He had a vision

for full, all-out 100 percent war demanding total surrender from our enemies. I can take some issue with some of the decisions made along the way; but on balance, Roosevelt was a very good wartime President. I just don't think he was a very good depression-era President.

And this President, I have no idea what kind of wartime President he would be. We are not in a depression. Some will say we are in the Great Recession. That is the vernacular that has been adopted most. But this Great Recession that we appear to be in has spent a lot more money than was spent during the Great Depression of the 1930s. The result, I believe, will be similar.

If you take a business, we can think in terms of a small business, a small business that generates \$100,000 a year in gross receipts, and perhaps has a \$10,000 mortgage with a 10 percent loan on it. This is so I can do the math as I am talking. So your \$100,000 in gross receipts needs to pay the proprietor, pay the utility bills, and all of the overhead, as well as the interest. So if you are grossing \$100,000 with a \$10,000 loan, then 10 percent of that loan would be \$1,000. And if you are paying \$1,000 in interest, and let's just say you are going to retire that debt on a 10 year loan, so you pay 10 percent of the principal each year.

The first year it would be \$1,000 in interest and another \$1,000 in principal; \$2,000 out of your \$100,000 goes to pay the debt, to service the debt you have. And then you have to take your margins, your expenses out of the remaining \$98,000 and have enough to feed the proprietor and keep the proprietor engaged in the business.

Let's just say that all of a sudden, we have this economic crisis and the business is having trouble. It gets flooded or burned out or whatever it might be, and along comes on the Small Business Administration or some other entity, and they say we can keep you in business, but you can't stay in business unless you borrow \$100,000 and we will inject that \$100,000 of capital into your business. Well, that is nice. You get to stay in business.

Now you have \$109,000 worth of debt to service, but I will just go with the \$100,000 because I am speaking off the cuff and I can do the math as we fly. Now your interest burden is not \$1,000 on the \$10,000 debt you had, it is \$10,000 interest on the \$100,000 debt you have, and the 10 percent you were paying on principal of the \$10,000 debt, that \$1,000, now becomes \$10,000.

So your business that was servicing with \$2,000 a \$10,000 debt, now has to have two \$20,000s to serve the \$10,000 worth of interest and the \$10,000 worth of principal on your \$100,000 debt.

You have taken your ability, your gross receipts in the business are similar or the same. You can only service \$2,000 on the old way of financing with the \$1,000 of interest and \$1,000 worth of principal, \$2,000 out of your \$100,000

gross, but when they give you this nice loan that you borrowed \$100,000, now you have to figure out how to service \$10,000 worth of interest and \$10,000 worth of principal out of a \$100,000 worth of gross receipts. Instead of it being 2 percent, now it is 20 percent.

I hope this example, Madam Speaker, is explanatory to the President of the United States, to Larry Summers, to the people that are looking at this economy and believing that John Maynard Keynes had some answers. He had answers all right, but they were the wrong ones, Madam Speaker.

We need to reduce the debt. We need to reduce spending, and only when we do that can we have a free market economy that will work its way out of this and let us be able to pay the interest and pay down the debt so that this economy can finally get around to the side where it is not constantly burdened servicing interest and debt as opposed to the legitimate functions of government.

We did had 2 or 3 years here where we had a balanced budget. There are some reasons for that. I will give Bill Clinton a little credit. And I will give the Republican Congress a lot of credit. They came in here revolutionaries and they decided that they were going to choke spending down, and they did that. I think also, though, the economy outgrew their predictions and so they were a bit surprised when they balanced the budget.

I think Bill Clinton was a bit surprised when the budget came balanced. Those are the fortunate happenstances of history. We need to be more prudent than that even.

We are going to have to go back. This debt commission that meets tomorrow, that starts out with Erskine Bowles and former Senator Alan Simpson as co-chairs, they are going to examine all of this debt and figure out how to look at the debt and the income to bring America into something that is more responsible. I don't think that they think that they are going to balance the budget or make a proposal that will balance the budget, I think they believe that they are going to look at the spending and the income and make some kind of a recommendation that would help compensate the calamity that we are in.

But, Madam Speaker, I would submit that if you want a committee to produce a result, write up that result. Tell me the result you would like and present it to me, and I can appoint for you the committee that will produce the result that you want. That is how it has been done around this Hill since time immemorial, how it is done in the real world, how it is done in the city council meetings and the county supervisory meetings and within the outside committees of our State legislatures. And that is not a criticism of the people who sit on that debt commission.

□ 2200

They are good people by and large and by balance. But they do not rep-

resent, I don't believe, the creative ideas in the United States. First of all, I look through that list of people on the commission; I don't find a single person on that commission that supports a national sales tax. I don't find a single person that has advocated for the abolishment of the IRS and the Federal income tax. Not one. Smart people there, yes. Their decisions, though, and their positions, from what I have seen, are not economic positions exclusively. They are pragmatic economic decisions that are tempered by their judgment of political reality.

So couldn't we at the very least, if we wanted to provide solutions for America, couldn't we set all of our politics aside, take away all of this pragmatism that is political pragmatism, not economic realism, throw that off to the side, park it over there in the parking lot, can't we clean out all of the political jargon that's there and sit down and first ask the question: What would be the smartest thing we could do economically in this country? And in the process of doing that, how do we fund this government, the necessary components of the Federal Government?

Madam Speaker, those are the basic questions I have been asking about this country for 30 years. And I am making a recommendation to the debt commission. And I trust that they will overhear this discussion that you and I are having tonight, Madam Speaker. But it comes down to this: if we were going to devise a tax policy for the United States starting from scratch, that proverbial blank slate or a blank piece of paper, that tax policy, Madam Speaker, would not be the Internal Revenue tax or code. We would not generate the IRS. We would not look at this as a tax on income.

Because here is what Ronald Reagan once said. Ronald Reagan once said, "What you tax you get less of." He also said, "What you subsidize you get more of." But I will stick with the tax side of this. What you tax you get less of. The tax is a punishment. We here in America tax, and that is in quotes "punish" all productivity in the United States.

If you have earnings, savings or investment, if you punch the time clock and go to work, if you start a business and put your sweat equity matched up with what capital you might have, package that together and start a little factory or a service company, or start marketing an invention, whatever it is that you might do, the IRS will come along and identify that productivity and tax it, punish it, shrink it, take away your incentive to produce it.

Production is what drives this economy, not spending. That's a Keynesian mistake. It's not and never has been an economy that is driven by government spending or the Federal Government borrowing and bonding and putting cash in the hands of people so they spend it into the economy to get this to recover. That is not the answer.

Our answer is we need to produce. We need to increase the production in

America, in competition with the rest of the world, and market more goods and services and drive our gross domestic product up. And when we do that, we will see prosperity, the prosperity that comes from our efficiencies, from our productivity producing goods and services that have value. And so when Ronald Reagan said, "What you tax you get less of," he was recognizing that we punish productivity.

The Internal Revenue Service and the income tax code are completely dedicated to taxing all productivity in America, punishing all productivity in America, setting aside everything that is good and productive about our economy and taxing it.

So if you punch a time clock and you go forward and you earn wages, you are taxed on it. At least the payroll tax. The Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid tax, that is on there. You will pay your income tax when you reach a certain threshold. If you have earnings, savings or investment, if you are going to cash in your dividend check, your capital gains, your interest check, all of that's taxed by the IRS.

If you go through life and you acquire an equity base, a net worth, and perhaps you pay the tax on all of your income as you go along, and maybe even your investments didn't appreciate in value and were never taxed in that fashion—if they were you would have paid it—but you have a nest egg of, let's say, \$10 million, which is a pretty good lifetime of work, this year you could die and pass it along to your children because the Democrats are asleep at the switch. They would like to tax your estate. They just haven't gotten around to doing that, partly because the gavel in the Ways and Means Committee has been in three different hands, all of that within 24 hours by the way.

All of your productivity, all of your earnings from your work, all of your earnings from your investments and your management of whatever business you might start or your dividends, your capital gains, your interest income, your estate tax, all of that is taxed, all of that is productivity, all of that is punished by the Federal Government today. So what do we get? We get less productivity. We get less investment because the cost of capital goes up. And we get less savings because the interest income on the savings will be taxed by the IRS.

We will have fewer dividends because companies are looking to figure out how they can avoid the corporate income tax in order to not pay out the dividends that come from the profits. And their dividends themselves are taxed. When the board of directors cashes in on those dividends, they are looking at the tax liability; so they are thinking, let's roll it. I don't want to take that out because the IRS will come in and tax.

And by the way, investments in foreign lands, if they are repatriated into

the United States, there will be a capital gains tax against that or an income tax against that as well. So there is in the order of \$13 billion in private sector capital that is stranded overseas that isn't coming back to the United States because there is a penalty there for bringing it into this economy. If we would just suspend the tax on all the capital overseas, we would see trillions come back into the United States. Five trillion perhaps in the first year, most if not all of that in the succeeding years.

That's why the fair tax is the right way to go. There are many good reasons why the fair tax is the right way to go, Madam Speaker. But the biggest reason—two big reasons—one big reason is the fair tax ends the IRS. It ends the Internal Revenue Code. It ends the punishment to productivity in America. It stops the punishment of earnings, savings and investment, and lets a person earn all they can earn, save all they want to save, invest all they want to invest, and in fact take the proceeds from the investments out and move them around, put them in an investment where they will return better rather than having to pay tax when you cash that check in.

So now we have all of these people that are involved in tax avoidance, all the tax attorneys that are involved, H & R Block involved in tax avoidance because the taxes may be avoided, they are delayed; but in effect they are often not circumvented. They must be paid eventually. Most of them. That's what this Tax Code is set up to do.

My position is this: I am for H.R. 25. I am for the national sales tax. I am for the fair tax. And what it does, it takes all tax off of productivity, it abolishes the IRS, it puts the tax over on consumption, where it provides an incentive for savings and investment. When you tax consumption, that encourages people to invest and save. And they can build their nest egg. And the capital comes back to the United States. That big chunk of that \$13 trillion comes back to the United States.

And all of these high-rise buildings that have highly paid tax lawyers in it and the corporations that have whole floors of their buildings dedicated to tax attorneys, tax advisers, accountants for the purpose of avoiding taxes, all that goes away. And that human capital, the very smart people, moral, hardworking, ethical people who have legitimate jobs in today's environment, they could turn their focus into producing something that has value rather than tax delay or tax avoidance.

□ 2210

Think what it would be like to take all of those smart brains and turn them loose to help us figure out how to be more productive. Some of them will go out and start a business. Those businesses will go up, and they will be publicly traded businesses eventually. Some of them will go to work for other companies, and they will add to the

value of those companies because of their creative ideas. Some of them will be such good nuts-and-bolts accountants that they'll find other ways for companies to make money, and it might well be their companies. Some are entrepreneurs, but the creativity of America is diminished because we're locking up a bunch of human capital to audit and punish the productivity of the American people.

What sense does that make, Madam Speaker? Why do we have a sense of class envy against people who would be productive and who would make money?

Now, I'm not among them. I'm not going to die a rich man, Madam Speaker. There is nobody in my lineage who's going to pass it along to me. I've dedicated my life to this public service and have made a little money in my time, not enough to talk about and certainly not enough to brag about, but I've engaged in this free enterprise economy.

I started a business in 1975 when I had a negative net worth of \$5,000. I went out and bought an old, beaten-up bulldozer, an old D-717A. That machine was so decrepit that I couldn't even put it to work to make my first dollar until I took the welder out and welded on it for 2 weeks before I could get it stuck together enough that I could put it to work. I put it to work. After 3 hours, I watched the old pressure gauge go from the peg of high pressure all the way down to zero—just about like that. As that happened, I dropped the throttle down and shut the machine off. I had to tear the engine all the way down and had to put it all the way back together in the rain. My wife was standing there, 4½-months pregnant with our first child, and I was torquing head bolts on a D-7, in the rain, in September. That's how we got started.

I have an appreciation for what it takes to start a business, to make that business go, to grow that business to where we can hire people and can pay wages and benefits. I certainly have an appreciation, Madam Speaker, for walking into my construction office sometime in the early 1990s when I first noticed this. My secretary had taken our Christmas tree and had decorated that Christmas tree with gold silhouettes of Christmas trees, of Santa and a sleigh, of baby Jesus, of the Star of Bethlehem, of snowflakes. Each one of those on that tree was engraved with the name of either an employee, a spouse or one of their children, and there were enough who were dependent upon King Construction to decorate that entire Christmas tree. That was the time it really hit me that the decisions that I made affected the lives of all of those families and their children. It was something that weighed on me heavily but that also gave me great joy during that time—to see that we had built something that so many people were dependent upon, something that was good and just and honest and decent and productive. Of course, the tax burden on that was one of the anchors

that we had to drag all the way through.

So I had come to a conclusion that I wanted to eliminate the IRS, that I wanted to end this punishment for productivity, that I wanted to put the tax on consumption, to let people earn all they could earn, to save all they could save, to invest all they wanted to invest, to accept the proceeds of their investments, and to move them around without penalty. Sell anything you want to sell. Take your capital gains. Put it in the bank, and do what you want to do. Yet, when you spend the money, pay the tax.

I understand, and I would think that anybody at this level of government should understand that businesses don't pay taxes. Corporations, sole proprietorships, LLCs don't pay taxes. They collect taxes for government. They pass the costs of taxes through to the consumer, but they don't pay taxes. If they didn't pass those costs along, they would be broke, and we all know that. Businesses are effective and efficient collectors of taxes for government, but they are not taxpayers. So we can get to two principles here:

One I've spoken about in some depth, which is that taxing productivity reduces our productivity. Increasing our productivity is a solution for our economy, so we should take all of the tax off of productivity, and we should put it on consumption.

The next principle is that businesses don't pay taxes. They collect taxes from consumers. So why wouldn't we just allow the 44 or 45 States which currently have a sales tax to use the engine that they have, the system that they have, to collect the sales tax in the same fashion that they're collecting it at the retail outlets within their States now? No exemptions. We'd have to tax sales and service. Yes, government would have to pay that tax. They're paying it today in the embedded costs of the things that they buy. The government has to pay tax. There has got to be a tax on sales and service, and it would only be the last stop on the retail dollar.

So, if it's a farmer, for example, rest easy because, if you go out and buy a new combine or a planter or a tractor or a rotary hoe, or whatever it is that it might be that you need, you wouldn't have to pay sales tax on that equipment because that's a business input cost. So you can buy equipment. You can put it into your fleet. You can work it, but you don't have to pay sales tax on that equipment because it's a business input cost; but if you buy, for example, a cap to put on your head while you ride around in that combine or while you pull that planter on that new tractor, you'd pay sales tax on the cap because that's a personal item. That's how the differentiation comes down. We would have to tax all goods and services.

So, if people are sitting there thinking, well, my pharmaceuticals will be exempted, no, sorry, we can't exempt

them either. Pharmaceuticals wouldn't be exempted. Neither would Pabulum or Pampers or any of these products that we would call "food" or preferred items for those organizations or entities that we think we'd like to untax, because, as soon as we start creating exemptions, then there's another exemption that has equal or more merit. Pretty soon, it would narrow the tax base to the point where the rate would be too high and we couldn't sustain this. It has to be no exemptions. All tax on sales and services must be paid.

If you were to go out and build a new house, you would pay a sales tax on the materials—on the lumber, on the plumbing, which are all of the things that go into a new house, and on the labor. Though, if you would sell that new house the next week, there would be no sales tax on it because it would be a used house, and the tax would have already been paid on the materials and on the labor. Now, that might seem like a high cost for a new house except that the cost of those materials that would go into the house would be, on average, 22 percent cheaper. That's because there is an embedded Federal tax in everything that we buy, which averages at 22 percent. Remember, these businesses don't pay taxes. They pass them along to the consumers. Here is how it works, Madam Speaker:

Their businesses will factor it into their prices, and they must. That \$1 widget has an average of 22-cents' worth of embedded Federal taxes in the price. So, if you would pass this national sales tax, the Fair Tax, you would see competition drive the price down. Your \$1 widget would be priced then at 78 cents. Twenty-two percent of the embedded cost of that \$1 widget would go down to 78 cents. Yes, you'd have to add back in a 23 percent embedded national sales tax in that on the sales and on the service. Yes, that would take that up to just a skosh over \$1 again. Yet people would get 56 percent more in their paychecks. They would have a lot more money to spend. The retail prices wouldn't look a lot different when you'd be done paying the tax than they would today, but the difference is that everybody would see how expensive the Federal tax is, and they would make less demands on government because it would make every-one a taxpayer.

Let me tell you the story of little Michael Dix, who is the son of an outstanding once and future State legislator in Iowa. Little Michael was about 8 years old when this happened. We have a 7 percent sales tax in the State, in many of the regions, and I trust it was in this one. He'd saved up his money, and he wanted to go in and buy a little box of Skittles—those little sweets that are there on the counter. They were 89 cents, and he'd saved his money and had counted it out. He went in and got his Skittles out and laid them up on the counter at the convenience store. He counted out his money, the 89 cents, all the way up to the right penny.

The lady who ran the checkout register rang it up, and said, Okay. That'll be 96 cents.

He looked at her, and he said, But they're 89 cents. That's what it says on the box.

She said, Well, no. You've got to pay the Governor. You've got to pay the tax.

So there he is with the 89 cents, having saved it to buy his Skittles. It's a transaction that's pretty important to Michael Dix, as it should be to any young child that age. He found out that he had to pay the tax and that she wanted 96 cents.

He turned to his dad, and he said, Dad, I have to pay tax on Skittles?

Imagine, Madam Speaker. Imagine what that does. I don't think Michael Dix is going to be a guy who's going to grow up demanding that the Federal Government produce more things for him. I don't think he's going to be one who's going to tolerate higher taxes. I think this young man is going to grow up to personal responsibility, very well aware of how burdensome the Federal and the State governments are. He'll make sure that when government provides a service that it's a good value for that and that it's a necessary service, not one that's frivolous—or, man, he's going to know always that the money came out of the pocket of Michael Dix and that it didn't come out, necessarily, of the pocket of some anonymous person.

It's personal. The national sales tax, the Fair Tax, makes this personal, Madam Speaker. It makes it personal for millions and millions of kids who are growing up in America and who are making billions of transactions. Every time, they're being reminded that the Federal Government is expensive. An expensive Federal Government that makes everybody a taxpayer becomes a Federal Government that those taxpayers demand less of. More freedom. Less taxes. That's the equation.

The national sales tax, the Fair Tax, H.R. 25, is transformative. It's transformative from an economic standpoint because it takes all of the taxes off of productivity, and it puts all of the taxes on consumption. It provides an incentive for earnings, savings, and investments. It abolishes the punishment for production, which is a tax on corporate, personal, and business income tax and taxes on capital gains, investments, interest income, and all of the components—the State tax included. It does all of those things. The Fair Tax does everything good that anybody's tax reform does. It does them all. It does them all better, and the American people are getting closer to understanding what this means.

The American people can visualize what happens—a world without the IRS, a world without punishment for production, a world that has little kids growing up like Michael Dix, who is now a young man who understands that paying taxes is a personal experience. It's transformative, Madam

Speaker, for this country to move down the path of a national sales tax and toward abolishing the IRS.

Some will say they support a national sales tax, H.R. 25, the Fair Tax, provided that we first repeal the 16th Amendment, but that sets up an impossible bar. Can we imagine any piece of legislation that we would predicate upon the passage of a constitutional amendment? What if we had the flat tax and we had to pass a constitutional amendment before we could adopt the flat tax? What if we had to pass a constitutional amendment before we raised the debt ceiling? What if we had fixated in the Constitution of the United States a debt ceiling that we couldn't surpass? I think that would be a good thing, actually. I'd like to ratchet it down from where it is now. We couldn't pass that constitutional amendment. The bar is too high. The bar is too high to set the standard that passing the repeal of the 16th Amendment is a condition to adopt a national sales tax. Here is the reality of it:

H.R. 25, the Fair Tax, does this. It starts the process for the repeal of the 16th Amendment and abolishes the IRS. It abolishes the Income Tax Code in its entirety.

Can we imagine the American people freed of the burden of the IRS—freed from the fear of audit? The American people get 56 percent more on their paychecks. They make their own decisions on when to pay their taxes, and the IRS becomes a thing of history, and the Internal Revenue Code—the punishment, the tax on all productivity—is gone.

Do we think for a minute, Madam Speaker, that this Congress of the American people would tolerate the reestablishment of the IRS or the reestablishment of the Income Tax Code? No, they would not. In fact, they would be so glad to get 56 percent more on their paychecks and would be so glad to have the freedom to make the decisions on when to pay their taxes rather than having the IRS tell them, You shall pay it out of every dollar that you make, that they would never tolerate the reestablishment of the IRS nor the reestablishment of the Tax Code. It's that simple. They would, I believe, chase the 16th Amendment down with a great joy that they would be relieved of it, and they would eventually abolish it and repeal it.

Yet, to set the condition as a bar to pass the Fair Tax, it is too high a bar. It's not an impossibility, but it's an extreme difficulty, and it becomes a semantics argument rather than a practical one. So, Madam Speaker, I'll make this point:

In 30 years of making this argument, I have never run into an argument for some other tax reform that is economically superior to the national sales tax, to the Fair Tax. I have not run into that argument. I have not been in a debate where I thought that the other side made a point that I had trouble addressing economically. The only

point that they can make is that, in their judgment, it's too difficult to pass politically.

Well, when you tell the American people that the IRS is going to be gone and that we're going to put those smart, good people at the IRS to work in the productive sector of the economy instead of in the burdensome sector of the economy, they're going to cheer. They're going to stand up, and they're going to applaud. They've done that for me over and over again.

The time is right. The economy is in a sad condition. We don't have a President who understands this free market economy. I don't think he believes in it. He has been nationalizing it right and left. He has been nationalizing the three large investment banks; AIG, the insurance company; Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac; General Motors; and Chrysler. The Student Loan Program has been completely taken over by the Federal Government. ObamaCare has swallowed up the most sovereign thing that we have, our bodies. Our skin and everything inside it has now been taken over and is managed by the Federal Government.

This President and this majority in Congress don't begin to understand the sovereignty of the individual or the free market system that we have, but the American people understand, Madam Speaker. The American people are going to be given a choice this November. They are going to choose freedom. They are going to choose liberty. They are going to choose constitutional conservatism. I look forward to the transformation, to the freedom, and to the liberty that comes from the people who step up to their own personal responsibility.

I thank you so much for your indulgence and for your attention here this evening, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CUMMINGS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Ms. FUDGE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of illness.

Mr. FLEMING (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of unavoidable travel delays resulting from inclement weather.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALTMIRE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALTMIRE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POSEY, for 5 minutes, April 29.

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, April 27 and 28.

Mr. DENT, for 5 minutes, April 28.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, April 27 and 28.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 27, 2010, at 10:30 a.m., for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7168. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alkyl (C12-C16) Dimethyl Ammonio Acetate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0479; FRL-8816-5] received April 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7169. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Kasugamycin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0695; FRL-8808-7] received April 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7170. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thifensulfuron methyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2009-0134; FRL-8818-9] received April 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7171. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting notification that the Average Procurement Unit Cost (APUC) and Program Acquisition Unit Cost metrics for the Army's Advanced Threat Infrared Countermeasure and Common Missile Warning System (ATIRCM/CMWS) program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7172. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting modernization priority assessments for the National Guard and Reserve equipment for Fis-

cal Year 2010; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7173. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Transitional Safe Harbor Protection for Treatment by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as Conservator or Receiver of Financial Assets Transferred by an Insured Depository Institution in Connection With a Securitization or Participation (RIN: 3064-AD55) received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

7174. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's report pursuant to the Buy American Act for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Financial Services.

7175. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Alternate Monitoring Requirements for Indianapolis Power and Light — Harding Street Station [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0118; FRL-9124-9] received April 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7176. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2010-0045; FRL-9124-5] received April 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7177. A letter from the Principal Deputy General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Transmission Relay Loadability Reliability Standard [Docket No.: RM08-13-000; Order No. 733] April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7178. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Particulate Matter Standards [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0731; FRL-9129-7] received April 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7179. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Pursuant to section 102(g) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for FY 1994 and 1995 (Pub. L. 103-236 as amended by 103-415), certification for FY 2010 that no United Nations affiliated agency grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes and condones or seeks the legalization of pedophilia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7180. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2009 prepared in accordance with the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7181. A letter from the Director Equal Employment Opportunity, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting notification that the National Endowment for the Humanities is in compliance with the No FEAR Act for fiscal year 2009 and that there were no incidents of discrimination reported; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7182. A letter from the Inspector General, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the results of an audit of the U.S. House of Representatives' annual financial statements for the fiscal year ending September

30, 2008; to the Committee on House Administration.

7183. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's quarterly report from the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties, pursuant to Public Law 110-53, section 803 (121 Stat. 266, 360); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7184. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 777-200, -200LR, -300, -300ER, and 777F Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0221; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-043-AD; Amendment 39-16233; AD 2010-06-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7185. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS 332 C, L, L1, and L2; AS 350 B3; AS355 F, F1, F2, and N; SA 365N and N1; AS 365 N2 and N3; SA 366G1; EC 130 B4; and EC 155B and B1 Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0663; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-25-AD; Amendment 39-16231; AD 2010-06-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7186. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6-45 and CF6-50 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0068; Directorate Identifier 2010-NE-05-AD; Amendment 39-16240; AD 2010-06-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7187. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. TFE731 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0331; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-40-AD; Amendment 39-16235; AD 2010-06-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7188. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Model 45 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0226; Directorate Identifier 2010-NM-034-AD; Amendment 39-16238; AD 2010-06-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7189. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Model S-76C Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2010-0242; Directorate Identifier 2009-SW-27-AD; Amendment 39-16232; AD 2010-06-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 25, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7190. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Repeal of Marine Terminal Agreement Exemption [Docket No.: 09-02] (RIN: 3072-AC 35) received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7191. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of 38 CFR 1.17 to

Remove Obsolete References to Herbicides Containing Dioxin (RIN: 2900-AN56) received April 8, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7192. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Carry-over Funds (RIN: 0970-AC40) received April 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7193. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Life Insurance Reserves — Actuarial Guideline XLIII [Notice 2010-09] received April 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7194. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Announcement and Report Concerning Advance Pricing Agreements [Announcement 2010-21] received April 5, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7195. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Publication of Inflation Adjustment Factor, Nonconventional Source Fuel Credit, and Reference Price for Calendar Year 2009 [4830-01-P] received April 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7196. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Travel Expenses of State Legislators [TD 9481] (RIN: 1545-BG92) received April 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7197. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2010-36] received April 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7198. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — PFIC shareholder reporting under new section 1298(f) for tax years beginning before March 18, 2010 [Notice 2010-34] received April 7, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[The following action occurred on April 23, 2010]

Mr. SKELTON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5013. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for performance management of the defense acquisition system, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-465, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

[Submitted April 26, 2010]

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1478. A bill to amend chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, to allow members of the Armed Forces to sue the United States for damages for certain injuries caused by improper medical care, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 111-466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following action occurred on April 23, 2010]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5013 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SKELTON (for himself and Mr. McKEON) (both by request):

H.R. 5136. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2011 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mrs. BONO MACK):

H.R. 5137. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for transporting minors in foreign commerce for the purposes of female genital mutilation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee):

H.R. 5138. A bill to protect children from sexual exploitation by mandating reporting requirements for convicted sex traffickers and other registered sex offenders against minors intending to engage in international travel, providing advance notice of intended travel by high interest registered sex offenders outside the United States to the government of the country of destination, requesting foreign governments to notify the United States when a known child sex offender is seeking to enter the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 5139. A bill to provide for the International Organizations Immunities Act to be extended to the Office of the High Representative in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the International Civilian Office in Kosovo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 5140. A bill to require the Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy to conduct a study and to prepare a comprehensive national economic competitiveness and innovation strategy; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Labor, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H.R. 5141. A bill to repeal the expansion of information reporting requirements for payments of \$600 or more to corporations, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself, Mr. SCHAUER, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 5142. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an investment tax credit for biofuel facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Mr. KUCINICH):

H. Con. Res. 267. Concurrent resolution congratulating the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the 20th anniversary of the reestablishment of their full independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H. Res. 1299. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Peace Officers Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 39: Ms. RICHARDSON and Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.

H.R. 162: Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 197: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 422: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 444: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 537: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 571: Mr. FLAKE and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 734: Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 745: Mr. DRIEHAUS.

H.R. 847: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 848: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 891: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 953: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1021: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1326: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 1547: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. BOCCIERI.

H.R. 1549: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1557: Mr. INSLER.

H.R. 1722: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1806: Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2049: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2061: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 2112: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 2142: Mr. McCAUL.

H.R. 2203: Mr. McCOTTER.

H.R. 2222: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2243: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 2324: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CLAY, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 2400: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 2408: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2478: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, and Mr. NADLER of New York.

H.R. 2483: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.

H.R. 2546: Mr. LEE of New York.

H.R. 2850: Ms. DELAULO.

H.R. 2866: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2999: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3041: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 3048: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 3070: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. SIREs.

H.R. 3268: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 3333: Mr. ARCURI.

H.R. 3339: Ms. GIFFORDS and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 3393: Ms. TITUS, Ms. KILROY, and Ms. BEAN.

H.R. 3440: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3441: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 3463: Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 3564: Ms. SPEIER and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 3577: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 3745: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3764: Mr. DRIEHAUS, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3790: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 3813: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 3995: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 4004: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 4051: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 4054: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FORBES, and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 4085: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 4090: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 4109: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4112: Mr. AUSTRIA and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 4241: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 4255: Mr. MELANCON and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.

H.R. 4278: Mr. WU, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. McCOTTER.

H.R. 4287: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 4306: Mr. ARCURI and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 4353: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 4371: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BONNER, Mr. COLE, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 4376: Mr. FARR, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 4392: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 4403: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 4440: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 4502: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 4520: Ms. DELAULO.

H.R. 4544: Mr. OWENS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 4597: Mr. HODES.

H.R. 4616: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 4630: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 4638: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4677: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 4684: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 4689: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 4692: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 4722: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 4785: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 4788: Mr. HOLT, Mr. SHULER, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 4790: Ms. HIRONO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 4844: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 4850: Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. BOCCIERI.

H.R. 4861: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 4886: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 4903: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 4904: Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 4908: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 4920: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SUTTON, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4947: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PORTENBERRY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 4995: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 5015: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 5017: Mr. SKELTON, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 5019: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HARE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 5029: Mr. LATTA and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 5032: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 5034: Mr. KIND, Mr. MICA, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. BARROW, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. SHULER, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. CHILDERS.

H.R. 5043: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. CHU, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 5054: Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 5058: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 5081: Mr. McMAHON.

H.R. 5092: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 5095: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 5102: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 5121: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 5125: Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.J. Res. 42: Mr. PETRI.

H. Con. Res. 110: Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. SCHOCK.

H. Con. Res. 128: Ms. NORTON, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BERRY.

H. Con. Res. 202: Mr. STUPAK.

H. Con. Res. 240: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H. Con. Res. 253: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H. Con. Res. 261: Mr. ROSS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HARE, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. MINNICK.

H. Con. Res. 262: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Con. Res. 265: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H. Res. 173: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. DRIEHAUS, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H. Res. 375: Mr. RAHALL.

H. Res. 407: Mr. BACA and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 886: Mr. MINNICK and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 898: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 1026: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H. Res. 1106: Mr. OWENS and Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Res. 1129: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Res. 1176: Mr. MINNICK.

H. Res. 1196: Mr. McCOTTER.

H. Res. 1201: Mr. PENCE, Mr. HILL, and Mr. SOUDER.

H. Res. 1208: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Res. 1211: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H. Res. 1226: Mr. McCAUL, Mr. WU, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H. Res. 1244: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 1245: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H. Res. 1251: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. McCOTTER.

H. Res. 1258: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. TEAGUE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. FARR, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. MATSUI,

Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CAO, Mrs. BONO MACK, Ms. CHU, Mr. ARCURI, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 1259: Ms. DELAURO.

H. Res. 1261: Mr. SCHRADER and Mr. LEE of New York.

H. Res. 1265: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 1277: Mr. HIMES, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 1279: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

H. Res. 1284: Mr. GRAVES.

H. Res. 1289: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H. Res. 1291: Mr. OWENS, Mr. MAFFEI, and Mr. HINCHEY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists of statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative SKELTON, or a designee, to H.R.

5013, the Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4753: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.